

Durham E-Theses

Revealing Rituals: Washings and Meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians

TURLEY, STEPHEN,RICHARD

How to cite:

TURLEY, STEPHEN,RICHARD (2013) *Revealing Rituals: Washings and Meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7338/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

**REVEALING RITUALS:
WASHINGS AND MEALS IN
GALATIANS AND 1 CORINTHIANS**

BY

STEPHEN RICHARD TURLEY

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham

Department of Theology and Religion

2013

Abstract

This thesis attempts to understand the place of rituals in the formation of early Christianity as represented by Galatians and 1 Corinthians.

Part I surveys the history of the interface between ritual studies and Pauline scholarship, identifying the scholarly gaps in both method and conclusions and a ritual theory adequate to address such gaps (Chapter 1). I argue that the ritual theory of Roy A. Rappaport provides a theoretical model whereby the various elements of Pauline ritualisation (cosmology, time, social order and ethics) can be synthesised and integrated. Our focus is on the two rituals that identified the Pauline communities: ritual washings and ritual meals. Our texts consist of Galatians and 1 Corinthians, two letters that present the richest spread of evidence pertinent to our ritual theory.

Part II explores ritual washings in Galatians and 1 Corinthians. We begin with baptism in Galatians, a ritual washing that reveals performatively the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the baptised, which in turn mediates a distinctly Christian social space (Chapter 2). Our analysis of 1 Cor 1:10-17 demonstrates that perpetuating Graeco-Roman social norms by the Corinthians risks compromising the apocalyptic integrity of the baptism ritual (Chapter 3); the washing of 1 Cor 6:11 establishes unambiguously the ethical identity of the baptised (Chapter 4); and 1 Cor 12:13 identifies baptism with the Spirit which, in fulfillment of Ezek 36:25-27, is the divinely-gifted means by which their ritualised ethical identity might be fulfilled (Chapter 5). We draw these conclusions together in a summary of baptism in Paul's epistles (Chapter 6).

Part III investigates ritual meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians. The Antiochene meals are analysed as embodiments of the 'truth of the gospel' which inform our understanding of the complex terms and argumentation in Gal 2:15-21 (Chapter 7). In the next chapter, we turn our attention to the role of the Lord's Supper in providing the frames of reference for coherence in 1 Corinthians 8-10 and the eating of food sacrificed to idols (Chapter 8). I argue that the Lord's Supper, as the fulfillment of the Jer 31:31-34 'new covenant' in Christ, provides the cosmological frames of reference in which the Corinthians' ethical identities are nurtured and sustained, and from which a distinct

Christian habitus is to be derived and maintained. After summarising our conclusions for the Lord's Supper (Chapter 9), we summarise the conclusions for this study (Chapter 10).

By exploring Paul's reference to ritual washings and meals with a heuristic use of ritual theory, we conclude that rituals in early Christianity were inherently revelatory, in that they revealed the dawning of a particular time (the messianic age) through the bodies of the ritual participants. This bodily revelation established both a distinctly Christian ethic and a distinctly Christian social space by which such an ethical identity might be identified and sustained.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

Declaration

This work has been submitted to the University of Durham in accordance with the regulations for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It is my own work, and none of it has been previously submitted to the University of Durham or in any other university for a degree.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Statement of Copyright	iv
Declaration	v
Contents	vi
Abbreviations	x

Part I History of Research: A Ritual Reading of Paul

1. Ritual Studies and Pauline Scholarship	2
1.1. Introduction	2
1.2. What is a Ritual Reading of Paul? Three Approaches	5
1.2.1. Socio-functional Significance of Pauline Rituals	6
1.2.1.1. Limitations of Socio-functional Analysis	11
1.2.2. The Ritualised Body	13
1.2.2.1. The Generative and Expressive Body	17
1.2.3. Ritual as Social Practice	19
1.3. Assessing the Field	25
1.4. Ritual Theory and Procedure	27
1.5. Summary	30

Part II Paul and Ritual Washings

2. Ritual Washing in Galatians: Time, Body and Social Order	33
2.1. Introduction	33
2.2. Tradition-Formula and Performatives in Galatians 3:26-29	34
2.3. The Relationship between πίστις and βαπτίζειν in Galatians 3:26-27	43
2.3.1. The Digital Transformation of Private Processes	47
2.3.2. Time and World in Antiquity	49
2.3.3. Baptism, Faith and Time	52
2.4. The Performative Significance of Baptism: The Body and Social Order ...	57
2.4.1. The Performative Uniqueness of Baptised Social Orders	60
2.5. Conclusion: Ritual Washing in Galatians	67

3. A Tale of Two Baptisms: 1 Corinthians 1:10-17	70
3.1. Introduction	70
3.2. A Survey of Proposals for Baptism in 1 Cor 1:10-17	71
3.2.1. Baptism as the Cause of Divisions and its Deniers	72
3.2.1.1. The Influence of the Mystery Cults	72
3.2.1.2. The Hierarchical Nature of Rituals	74
3.2.1.3. The Influence of Roman Bathing Practices	75
3.2.2. The Denial of the Role of Baptism	75
3.3. Accounting for Paul's Attitude toward Baptism	78
3.4. Rituals and Social Order	81
3.5. A Ritualised Community at Corinth	83
3.6. Baptism 'in the Name of Christ'	84
3.7. Baptism 'in the Name of Paul'	87
3.8. Summary and Conclusions	93
4. Baptism, Ethics and the Eschatological Body: 1 Corinthians 6:11	95
4.1. Introduction	95
4.2. Baptism in 1 Cor 6:11	96
4.3. The Ritual Formation of Pauline Ethics	97
4.3.1. Ritual, Acceptance and the Establishment of Ethical Obligation	99
4.3.2. Baptism, Time and Ethics	101
4.3.3. Baptism and the Indicative-Imperative Ethic	103
4.3.4. Baptism, Ethics and the Spirit	107
4.3.5. Baptism and the Eschatological Body	109
4.4. Summary and Conclusions	111
5. Baptism and the Spirit: 1 Corinthians 12:13	114
5.1. Introduction	114
5.2. The Relationship Between πνεῦμα and βαπτίζειν	115
5.3. The Relationship Between ποτίζω and βαπτίζειν	124

5.4. Metaphoric Predication	127
5.5. The Purifying Spirit: The Ezekiel 36 Tradition in Second-Temple Judaism	128
5.6. Paul and Ezekiel 36:25-27	139
5.7. Summary and Conclusions	144
6. Paul and Ritual Washings: Conclusions	147
Part III Paul and Ritual Meals	
7. The Antiochene Meals: Embodying the ‘Truth of the Gospel’	151
7.1. Introduction	151
7.2. The Nature of Mixed Table-Fellowship at Antioch: State of the Question	153
7.3. Ultimate Sacred Postulates and the Mechanisms of Embodiment	156
7.4. The ‘Truth of the Gospel’ and the Antiochene Meals	159
7.5. The Antiochene Meals and the Significance of Embodiment for Gal 2:15-21	166
7.5.1. Seeing is Believing: Galatians 2:15-16	168
7.5.2. ἔργα νόμου	169
7.5.3. δικαίω/ δικαιοσύνη	172
7.5.4. πίστις Χριστοῦ	175
7.5.5. Galatians 2:17-21 and an Eschatological Lifeworld	178
7.6. Summary and Conclusions	182
8. The Logos of the Lord’s Supper: 1 Corinthians 8-10	185
8.1. Introduction	185
8.2. Coherence and the Corinthian Correspondence	186
8.3. Ritual and Cosmology: The Formation of a Liturgical Logos	191
8.4. Cosmology and Habitus: The Socially Inscribed Body	193
8.5. Social Practice, Disposition and Cosmology: 1 Cor 8:1-13	193
8.5.1. Two Contrasting Social Practices: Feasting and Abstaining	194
8.5.2. Two Contrasting Dispositions: Arrogance and Love	198

8.5.3. Two Contrasting Cosmologies: Idols and Christ	201
8.6. The New Covenant and the Ritual Meal	204
8.6.1. The Lord's Supper and the Eschatological Presence of Christ	206
8.6.2. The Lord's Supper and Cosmic Space	212
8.6.3. The Lord's Supper and the Ethics of Self-Giving	221
8.7. Fostering a Christian Habitus: 1 Cor 10:23-11:1	229
8.8. Summary and Conclusions	232
9. Paul and Ritual Meals: Conclusions	238
10. A Ritual Reading of Paul: Conclusions	241
Bibliography	245

Abbreviations

With the exception of those listed below, all abbreviations in both text and bibliography follow the *Journal of Biblical Literature's Handbook of Style*.

<i>B. Civ.</i>	Lucan, <i>The Civil War</i> (see bibliography).
<i>CIMRM</i>	M.J. Vermaseren, ed., <i>Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae</i> 2 Vols., The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956, 1960.
Dio Cass.	Dio Cassius, <i>Roman History</i> (see bibliography).
<i>JATS</i>	<i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i> .
JRASup	Journal of Roman Archeology, supplement.
Plb.	Polybius, <i>Histories</i> (see bibliography).
<i>V. Pythag.</i>	Iamblichus, <i>On the Pythagorean Life</i> (see bibliography).

Part I

History of Research: A Ritual Reading of Paul

Ritual Studies and Pauline Scholarship

1.1. Introduction

Pauline scholars have increasingly taken the rituals practiced by the earliest Christians as a primary object of study over the last few decades. As part of a wider trend in biblical studies that involved interpretive approaches using theoretical disciplines from the social sciences, attention to rituals has proven to be an especially illuminative window into the social dynamics and rationales for the distinguishing practices that characterised the Pauline communities. The range and scope of activities interpreted as rituals by Pauline scholars extend from the central performances of initiation washings and corporate meals, to practices such as prayer, invocations, confessions, formal gatherings and rhetoric, to distinct gestures such as kissing and the laying on of hands. The advantages wrought by attention to such activities are made evident by a few examples from recent developments in Pauline secondary literature. Louise Lawrence highlights how ritual constitutes a foundry for the construction of a distinct Christian identity in such areas as ethics, social memory, community solidarity and anti-imperial resistance.¹ Larry Hurtado has made the sustained argument that the clearest evidence for a divine Christology in the theology of Paul is most pointedly manifested in the devotional practices of early Christians.² Christian Strecker has proposed that Paul's unique sense of time was an extension of an idiosyncratic temporal experience specific to liminal ritual processes.³ Jorunn Økland has argued that the Pauline conception of gender in 1 Corinthians 11 was forged within the broader discourse of ritual/ sanctuary space in early

¹ "Ritual and the First Urban Christians: Boundary Crossings of Life and Death," in Todd D. Still and David G. Horrell (eds.), *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 99-115.

² *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 17-92; *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

³ *Die liminale Theologie des Paulus: Zugänge zur paulinischen Theologie aus kulturanthropologischer Perspektive* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

Roman Corinth.⁴ And Michael Penn has examined how the exchange of a ‘holy kiss’ in early Christian communities functioned as a ritual gesture of social boundary formation.⁵

The anthropological theory used to interrogate the ritual life of the earliest Christians has been as diverse as the ritual practices studied. Risto Uro has schematised three theoretical approaches to the study of the NT: (1) the *genealogical* approach, which seeks to uncover the origin or archetype of a ritual practice, (2) the *functionalist* approach, which seeks to explain ritual practice in terms of what rituals do for their participants, particularly the role of ritual in the creation of communities and ethical obligations, and (3) the *symbolist* approach, which seeks to examine ritual acts and media as codes of communication.⁶ Prominent among these research projects have been theorists such as Arnold van Gennep, Victor Turner, Mary Douglas, Clifford Geertz and Catherine Bell. According to Lawrence, the cumulative effect of the interface between these theoretical approaches and a ritual reading of Paul has been an analytical shift from understanding rituals as expressive of a more basic narrative or mythology to an emphasis on what ritual actually does on its own terms within the life of a community.⁷ This shift has left a conspicuous impression particularly on the nomenclature associated with biblical studies, where terms specific largely to the field of anthropology have now become almost commonplace in Pauline scholarship, such as ‘liminality’, ‘communitas’, ‘initiation’, ‘rites of passage’, ‘habitus’, ‘ethnography’, ‘thick description’, ‘purity systems’, ‘boundaries’ and ‘emic/etic descriptions’.

As one would surmise from the variegated theoretical approaches to ritual analysis, a controverted issue among Pauline scholars has been the definition and nature of ritual, though it should be noted that the controversy over what precisely constitutes ritual is itself a step forward from what Gerald Klingbeil has exposed as the propensity among NT scholars to omit an adequate definition of what they mean by their use of ‘ritual’.⁸ Wayne Meeks turns to a growing number of social scientists’ construal of ritual as a form

⁴ *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSup 269; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

⁵ *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

⁶ Risto Uro, “Ritual and Christian Origins,” in D. Neufeld, R. DeMaris (eds.), *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 2010), 223-35.

⁷ Lawrence, “Ritual,” 106.

⁸ Gerald Klingbeil, “Between Law and Grace: Ritual and Ritual Studies in Recent Evangelical Thought,” *JATS* 13/2 (2002): 46-63.

of communication. Following Edmund Leach, to interpret ritual is, “in effect, trying to discover the rules of grammar and syntax of an unknown language.”⁹ Margaret MacDonald employs the conception of ritual formed by Clifford Geertz as ‘consecrated behaviour’.¹⁰ Both Gerd Theissen and Christian Strecker draw from Victor Turner in understanding ritual as the process of an ongoing social dialectic between structure and anti-structure.¹¹ For Jerome Neyrey, rituals involve binary forming mechanisms that create boundaries for the protection of the identity of a social group.¹² Ithamar Gruenwald is generally satisfied with Roy Rappaport’s definition of ritual as denoting “*the performance of more or less invariant sequences of formal acts and utterances not entirely encoded by the performers.*”¹³

Nomenclature also is contested. While Meeks uses the term ‘ritual’ as an overall label for the whole range of activities which take place in the worship of the Pauline communities, MacDonald uses the terms ‘initiatorial rite’ and ‘memorial rite’ to describe baptism and the Lord’s Supper respectively.¹⁴ Jerome Neyrey, drawing from the work of the anthropologist Victor Turner, adopts the term ‘rite’ as the genus while making a distinction between two species: ‘rituals’, the purpose of which is status reversal or transformation (e.g. baptism) on the one hand, and ‘ceremonies’, which serve essentially to confirm roles or status (e.g. Lord’s Supper) on the other.¹⁵ Klingbeil understands ‘ritual’ as a subcategory of the genus ‘cult’, and ‘subrite’ as a constituent of ‘ritual’.¹⁶ Stowers, following Catherine Bell, advocates jettisoning the terms ‘ritual’ and ‘rites’ altogether, since they imply an objectivised phenomenon removed from the agency of the

⁹ *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 141.

¹⁰ Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 62.

¹¹ Gerd Theissen, *The Religion of the Earliest Churches: Creating a Symbolic World*, trans. by John Bowden (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 122; Strecker, *Die liminale Theologie*, 40-82.

¹² *Paul, In Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990), 75-101.

¹³ *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 11, 247.

¹⁴ MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, 69.

¹⁵ Neyrey, *Paul*, 76-8.

¹⁶ Gerald Klingbeil, *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 5.

practitioner, advocating instead the use of the term ‘ritualisation’ to describe the various strategies that people use to set apart certain acts and utterances from the mundane.¹⁷

What we should take from the variegated definitional and terminological proposals is that the nomenclature associated with the study of rituals and the definitions entailed therein are particulars of a wider range of interpretive strategies by which biblical scholars formulate theory and evidence. Terminology and nomenclature, definition and description, are components of broader analytical categories that redescribe the ritual phenomena in accordance with the frames of reference of the social theory employed.¹⁸ Assessing the integrity of both the ritual theory and the Pauline data-turned-evidence will therefore be a central concern of this study.

The diversity and extent of ritual approaches to the study of Paul and his social milieu demonstrate that ritual readings offer a theoretically coherent interpretation for a wide range of issues in the field of Pauline studies. In the present chapter, I will provide an overview of just how far ritual readings of Paul have gone while identifying the questions and gaps that remain unresolved in such readings. I will then list out the questions that I want to pursue, including an explication of the ritual theory that I believe to be most conducive to their resolution.

1.2. What is a Ritual Reading of Paul? Three Approaches

I want to highlight what I consider to be the three major approaches to interpreting ‘ritual’ as a central theme in Pauline scholarship: the *socio-functional significance of rituals*, the *ritualised body*, and *ritual as social practice*. Rather than organise these approaches according to the various theoretical models employed, such as structural functionalism, symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, etc., I have categorised these studies according to their understanding of Pauline ritual as it emerges from an interface between theory and exegetical/ social data. Collectively, these readings provide both the rationales for and the exegetical and social insights from theoretical attention to rituals practiced by the earliest Christians.

¹⁷ Stanley K. Stowers, “Elusive Coherence: Ritual and Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 10-11,” in E.A. Castelli and H. Taussig (eds.), *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996), 68-83, 71-2.

¹⁸ Burton L. Mack, “On Redescribing Christian Origins,” in idem, *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy* (New York & London: Continuum, 2001), 59-80.

1.2.1. Socio-functional Significance of Pauline Rituals

Perhaps the single most prominent theoretical rationale for a ritual reading of Paul has been the distinctly *social* significance of ritual. The notion that rituals perform a social function that accounts uniquely for the integrity, identity and sustainability of an idea or population group has gained wide acceptance among biblical scholars. Beginning in the 1970s, historical reconstruction through the heuristic use of social scientific models turned attention away from the search for the origins of Christian beliefs and practices to their social etiology and function, which promised to shed fresh light on those beliefs and practices as they were forged and refined in the context of variegated social dynamics.¹⁹ Virtually every ritual-theoretical reading of Paul has involved some kind of analysis of the social processes that obtain specific to a ritualised state of affairs.

The theoretical framework for the formation and maintenance of the social in ritualised life can be traced to the definitive formulation of the French sociologist Emile Durkheim, who posited that rituals constituted the social conditions by which the classificatory concepts necessary for the normal functioning of society (e.g. space, time, genus, causality, quality, etc) were generated and internalised. However, the internalisation of these classificatory concepts was not a rational or intellectual process but rather an *ethical* one, imposed upon the mind through a sense of moral obligation.²⁰ Because the categories necessary for society are imposed upon human thought through a sense of social obligation, the categories are both ubiquitous (in that society would collapse without them) and culturally specific (since each society embeds the categories in ritually and culturally diverse ways).²¹ Rituals, for Durkheim, thus constituted the two dimensions, *social contract* and *moral obligation*, integration and regulation, by which the classificatory concepts necessary for the normal functioning of society are generated and internalised.²²

¹⁹ David G. Horrell, "Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect," in idem (ed.), *Social Scientific Interpretations of the New Testament*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 3; Risto Uro, "Ritual and Christian Origins," 225-6.

²⁰ Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, trans. by Joseph Ward Swain (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1954), 17.

²¹ *Elementary*, 17-20.

²² Cf. Warren Schmaus, "Categories and Classification in the Social Sciences," in Stephen P. Turner and Mark W. Risjord (eds.), *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 429-58, 434.

Durkheim's formulation provided a definitive model for the indispensable role of ritual for the formation and maintenance of a functioning social world. However, in construing ritual as representative of the prevailing social structure, Durkheim failed to account for the dynamic or processual nature of society, where the social effects become causes for ongoing subsequent effects, such that ritual functions as an agent for changing social conditions. It was Victor Turner who provided an alternative explanation that imagined ritual as an anti-structural process which transcends social norms.²³ Turner's theory is essentially a development of Arnold van Gennep's processual analysis of ritual structure against the backdrop of Clifford Geertz's conception of ethnographic "thick description."²⁴ Van Gennep argued notably that rituals constitute a transformative process made up of three phases: separation-transition-incorporation, or, in Turner's scheme, separation-seclusion-return.²⁵ Van Gennep explained that because societies are characterised by various distinctions among age or occupation groups, the transference from one social identity to another requires rituals that "enable the individual to pass from one defined position to another which is equally defined."²⁶ Essential to this process is the central ritual phase known as the liminal or transition stage (*limen* meaning 'threshold' in Latin), where the initiate embodies an ambiguous state, passing from one structure to another. As Turner observes, "Liminal entities, such as neophytes in initiation or puberty rites, may be represented as possessing nothing. They may be disguised as monsters, wearing only a strip of clothing, or even go naked, to demonstrate that as liminal [transitional] beings they have no status, property, insignia ... It is as though they are being reduced or ground down to a uniform condition to be fashioned anew and endowed with additional powers to enable them to cope with their new station in life."²⁷

Turner's contribution to ritual theory is his development of van Gennep's tripartite process into a Geertzian "thick description," that is, Turner sees rituals functioning as microcosms of the wider realm of social processes that are marked by "structure – anti-

²³ Jon P. Mitchell, "Ritual," in Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (eds), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* (London: Routledge, 1996), 491.

²⁴ Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture," in idem, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 3-30.

²⁵ Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, trans. by Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 10-11, *passim*; Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London: Aldine, 1969), 13-14.

²⁶ *Rites*, 3.

²⁷ *Ritual Process*, 95.

structure (or liminality/ *communitas*) – structure.”²⁸ The key here is the dynamic social dialectic between structure and anti-structure or *communitas*. Turner, following Lévi-Strauss, sees social structure as inherently a cognitive set of classifications, “a model for thinking about culture and nature and ordering one’s public life,” while *communitas* is marked by an existential quality: “it involves the whole man in his relation to other whole men.”²⁹ Social processes oscillate between well-defined and ordered social strata on the one hand and ambiguous and egalitarian social movements on the other, reciprocally pervading, informing and influencing one another in an ongoing teleological process.³⁰ Turner, moreover, argues that this ongoing reciprocity between structure and anti-structure can produce a state of what he calls “permanent liminality,” where groups, such as the early Franciscan movement, seek to maintain indefinitely the optimal conditions for the realisation of *communitas*.³¹ Ritual, as a microcosm of these larger macrocosmic social dynamics, provides precisely these optimal conditions and thus facilitates the perpetuity of this *communitas* state.

Turner’s ritual and social theories have exercised an enormous influence on subsequent ritual readings of Paul. Wayne Meeks, in his groundbreaking 1983 study, *The First Urban Christians*, was the first to analyse early Christian rituals in the explanatory terms provided by Turner’s social and anthropological theory. Meeks examined Pauline rituals as part of his larger project of determining how the social tensions and ambiguities produced by what sociologists term ‘status inconsistency’, characteristic of the more prominent members of the Pauline communities, could have been ameliorated or offset by the shared lifeworld inherent in such communities.³² Status inconsistency involves a dissonant coalescing, a ‘criss-crossing’, of incompatible status indicators such as language and place of origin, personal liberty or servitude, wealth, occupation, age and sex, producing such profiles as “independent women with moderate wealth, Jews with wealth in a pagan society, freedmen with skill and money but stigmatized by origin.”³³ In a society such as the Graeco-Roman world which valued rigidity and clarity in social

²⁸ *Ritual Process* 96-7.

²⁹ *Ritual Process* 127.

³⁰ *Ritual Process*, 96-7, 106-7, 127-9.

³¹ *Ritual Process*, 145.

³² Meeks, *First Urban*, 51-73.

³³ Meeks, *First Urban*, 191.

position, status ambiguity could have produced a sense of social alienation and anxiety, an emotional dissonance concomitant with social dissonance. For Meeks, the rituals shared in a distinctly Christian community, centered on what he termed the ‘major rituals’ of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, had the potential to transform and reinterpret the inconsistencies and ambiguities of social status. He turned to Turner’s concept of liminality to interpret the ‘marginal’ or ‘interstitial’ character of early Christian ritualised communities, which provided for initiates an alternative structure/ anti-structure paradigm with which to interpret their social ambiguity, such that “powerful symbols of change grounded in tradition, symbols of personal and communal transformation, symbols of an evil world encompassed by God’s judgment and grace would be particularly attractive to people who had experienced the hopes and fears of occupying an ambiguous position in society.”³⁴ Yet he noticed that these Paulinist groups, like every social movement, were in fact in the process of developing their own structures and could scarcely have evaded altogether the structures that surrounded them. “Thus,” Meeks concludes, “the dialectic between ‘structure and anti-structure’ that Turner describes appears again and again in the tensions addressed by the Pauline letters.”³⁵

A few years after Meeks’ study, A.J.M. Wedderburn’s critique of the history-of-religions research on the Pauline conception of baptism examined the Romans 6 pattern of the Christian washing rite in light of the structural and semiotic patterns observed by Turner and van Gennep.³⁶ Because of the ubiquity of these ritualised patterns, the Pauline baptismal teaching reflects a common framework of ideas within which Paul’s readers could understand his teaching about the Christian rite of initiation and its implications.³⁷ It is Wedderburn’s assertion that the ubiquity of the death/ resurrection (or death/ rebirth) pattern in initiation rites renders any attempt to establish direct dependence of early Christian baptism on initiation practices in Graeco-Roman mysteries by virtue of said pattern a *non sequitur*.³⁸ Wedderburn underscores his observation by comparing the reversal of values and the transcending of social binaries by which Paul describes

³⁴ *First Urban*, 191.

³⁵ *First Urban*, 89.

³⁶ *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against Its Graeco-Roman Background* WUNT 44 (Tübingen: Mohr-Seibek, 1987), 360-92.

³⁷ *Baptism*, 360ff.

³⁸ *Baptism*, 371-81.

Christian existence in Gal 3:28 with the characteristics of ‘liminal’ or ‘marginal’ existence as described by Turner.³⁹ He draws particular attention to the resemblance between Paul’s abolishing of the ‘male/female’ distinction and Turner’s observed ‘sexlessness’ that often obtains in liminal processes.⁴⁰

A year later, Margaret Y. MacDonald took a different tack in her approach to Pauline rituals. In her 1988 study, *The Pauline Churches*, MacDonald examines rituals as an essential component of her larger project of analysing the Pauline communities in light of Weber’s ‘routinisation of charisma’ and Berger and Luckmann’s concept of institutionalisation. MacDonald utilizes Clifford Geertz’s definition of ritual as ‘consecrated behaviour’ wherein one forms convictions of the truthfulness of religious conceptions and demonstrates acceptance of the soundness of religious directives.⁴¹ From this vantage point, rituals function to “stimulate group solidarity” by facilitating shared “patterns of symbolic action” which, for the Pauline communities, consisted primarily of “upbuilding rituals” (οἰκοδομή) that generated a distinct form of knowledge.⁴² Thus, baptism is appropriated didactically, as a “celebration of learning”; it is through baptism that one learns of one’s adoption as a child of God and incorporation into a family of joint heirs with Christ (cf. Rom 8:16-18; Gal 4:6-7).⁴³ And while baptism marks the beginning, it is the gathering for the Lord’s Supper that nurtures and rekindles the experience of Christ’s Lordship on a continuous basis, functioning to integrate the member into the community “time and time again.”⁴⁴

A decade after MacDonald’s publication, Christian Strecker published a bold study that proposed using Turner’s liminal theory for an anthropological synthesis of Paul’s theology. Strecker utilises Turner’s conception of social processes to explore what might be termed Paul’s ‘transformation theology’ (*Transformationstheologie*) and its ritual (what Strecker terms ‘minting’ or ‘stamping’) process (*rituelle Prägung*).⁴⁵ Strecker employs Turner’s theory as a conceptual tool by which to understand the dynamics of transformation, and delineates four levels of transformation in Paul’s letters: Paul’s

³⁹ *Baptism*, 386.

⁴⁰ *Baptism*, 386 n.22; cf. Turner, *Ritual Process* 102.

⁴¹ MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, 62; Geertz, *Interpretation*, 112.

⁴² MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, 65.

⁴³ MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, 67.

⁴⁴ MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, 69.

⁴⁵ Strecker, *Die liminale Theologie*, 82.

transformation into an apostle, the transformation of Christ through the cross, the transformation of the ages or aeons, and the transformation of community. From these levels, Strecker makes a particularly pertinent contribution to the Pauline conception of time, namely, the already-but-not-yet significance of the messianic eschaton.⁴⁶ Strecker notes that anthropological theory is in broad agreement that what qualifies as ‘time’ is in fact a social-cultural construction marked-off by the frequency of the culture’s rituals, ceremonies and festivals.⁴⁷ Against the backdrop of Paul’s phrase εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν in 1 Cor 10:11, Strecker interprets the Corinthian participation in baptism and the Lord’s Supper as experiencing time in a manner analogous to the desert wanderings of Israel so that the Corinthians, like the former Israelites, are experiencing presently the τέλος, that is, the goal, intention, or completion of world history in their concrete ritual encounters with God, with such rites communicating a permanent liminal existence for the Corinthians.⁴⁸ And because a significant feature of liminal time is the merging of otherwise distinct experiences of past, present and future, it can take on aspects of all three. Thus, ritualised liminality satisfies theoretically and exegetically the already/ not-yet distinctive of Paul’s eschatology.

1.2.1.1. Limitations of Socio-functional Analysis

There is no question that the socio-functional analysis of ritual has had an enormous influence on the ritual reading of Paul. The primary advantage of these explanations is their propensity to unify and model early Christian social dynamics in terms of how ritual functioned to generate and integrate various social components that contributed to the formation, stability and maintenance of distinct Christian beliefs and practices. Conversely, there are, I believe, two specific theoretical issues that pose considerable problems for functionalist explanations of early Christian rituals:

First, given the absence of explicit reflection on the social role of ritual on the part of the ritual populations studied, functional explanations more often than not exist because the need for social explanations among theorists makes them exist.⁴⁹ Socio-functional

⁴⁶ *Die liminale Theologie*, 212.

⁴⁷ *Die liminale Theologie*, 220.

⁴⁸ *Die liminale Theologie*, 228-9, 247.

⁴⁹ Harold Kincaid, “Functional Explanation and Evolutionary Social Science,” in Turner and Risjord, *Philosophy*, 213-48, 219.

approaches to Pauline rituals are therefore particularly susceptible to imprecise and anachronistic redescriptions. The functional explanations surveyed above would have been helped greatly by the clarification provided by a useful distinction between what has been termed ‘functional role analysis’ on the one hand and ‘selectionist explanations’ on the other. In this case, ‘functional role analysis’ involves determining the cause and effect relationship in a complex system regardless of intention, while ‘selectionist explanations’ demonstrate that something exists in order to do something. Philosopher of sociology, Harold Kincaid, illustrates helpfully this incidental/ intentional causal distinction:

If we ask why there is a carburetor on my old Toyota or what it does, we can answer that it serves to provide a proper mix of fuel and air to the pistons. We describe its typical causal inputs and outputs, its causal role in the system that is my car. However, knowing that it has a role does not mean it automatically exists in order to do so. A typical causal effect of my brake pads is to cause the rotors to wear, yet we know they weren’t designed in order to cause wear. In general showing that *A* has the systematic effect *B* is not the same as offering the explanation *A* exists because it does *B*.⁵⁰

None of the studies surveyed above seem even aware of a functional versus selectionist distinction, and thus it remains somewhat unclear as to what the functions of rituals actually were for Paul and early Christian communities.

Secondly, it is questionable whether Turner’s conception of liminality actually lives up to Turner’s descriptive and explanatory claims. One of Turner’s professors, Max Gluckman, argues that liminal processes in fact do not lie outside the dominant social structures altogether but rather manifest the structures of the dominant society in the context of liminal rebellion. In other words, the inversion of the dominant social order is still that social order merely reorganised. Thus, liminality is only significant “within an established structure which is asserted again afterwards, and which indeed is asserted during the liminal period itself, by inversion.”⁵¹ From a different vantage point, Mathieu Deflem, following the work of Erving Goffman, critiques Turner with instances where the liminal and liminoid do not at all challenge the dominant social structure and are devoid of any sense of *communitas*. For example, inmates in modern prisons and

⁵⁰ “Functional Explanation,” 220-1.

⁵¹ Mary Gluckman and Max Gluckman, “On Drama and Games and Athletic Contests,” in *Secular Ritual*, ed. by S.F. Moore and B. Myerhoff (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977), 227-243, 242.

institutions are subject to an outlet of the social order that imposes a process of ‘mortification’ where the self is stripped of any trace of individual identity.⁵² In fact, Turner himself progressively moved more toward analysing the phenomenon of *performance* as the state of affairs that generates the conditions of liminality, as in the case of what he termed ‘social dramas’, rather than vague social processes.⁵³ Said differently, the *concepts* of separation, liminality and integration don’t exist in the abstract but rather in concrete situations of performance.

1.2.2. The Ritualised Body

A second important theme in ritual theory and Pauline scholarship has been the significance of the human body as a site of social investment. Since Mauss’ classic notion of techniques of the body (1935), scholars have discovered the human body to be not a fixed material entity or a “brute fact of nature” but rather a richly ornate tapestry of social dynamics; in short, a cultural phenomenon.⁵⁴ “Bodiliness,” so writes Terence Turner,

is rightly recognized as a fundamental unifying category of human existence in all its senses and levels: cultural, social, psychological, and biological. The body is at one a material object and a living and acting organism possessing rudimentary forms of subjectivity that becomes, through a process of social appropriation, both a social identity and cultural subject. The social appropriation of bodiliness in all the above-mentioned senses is the prototype of all social production; the person constituted by a socialized and embodied subjectivity is the prototype of all products. The “socially informed body,” to use Bourdieu’s (1977) phrase, acts as both product and producer of this process of appropriation and in many societies thereby directly becomes the paradigm of the structure of society and the cosmos as well.⁵⁵

In contrast to the Enlightenment’s relativisation of the body in favor of the quest for a ‘pure reason’, the contemporary emphasis on bodily comportment has accompanied an increasing awareness within the academy of the manifoldness of knowledge in relation to self and society. In as much as the mind exists *in* a body, it has been recognised by philosophers, anthropologists and sociologists alike that we as humans cannot but

⁵² Matheiu Deflem, “Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner’s Processual Symbolic Analysis,” in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30 (1991): 1-25.

⁵³ Victor Turner, *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York: PAJ Publications, 1988).

⁵⁴ Thomas J. Csordas, “Introduction: The Body as Representation and Being-In-The-World,” in idem (ed.), *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1-3, 1.

⁵⁵ Terence Turner, “Social body and Embodied Subject: Bodiliness, Subjectivity, and Sociality Among the Kayapó,” *Cultural Anthropology* 10 (2) (1995): 143-170, 145.

experience ourselves simultaneously *in* and *as* our bodies.⁵⁶ Statements such as “My foot hurts” and “I am in pain” are in fact synonymous statements that indicate I don’t just have a body; I am my body. We experience things done to our bodies as done to ourselves.⁵⁷

The recognition of the centrality of the body in human social identity has provided the foundry for a rich appreciation of the role of the body in the shaping of human culture. In the highly influential *Purity and Danger*, the renowned social anthropologist Mary Douglas made the connection between the physical body and social body, noting that cultural concerns about the body, such as taboo codes, ethical identity, conceptions of purity, are frequently metaphors for social relationships and boundaries.⁵⁸ This last term, *boundaries*, is a key motif for Douglas, who theorised that each individual body within the group ‘body’ will share in the boundedness of the group, with the restrictions of the social macrocosm embodied and reflected in each individual corporal microcosm. In her 1973 work, *Natural Symbols*, Douglas attempted to explain this relationship between body, society and cosmology by appealing to linguistic theory which entailed evidence that human perception of the world was shaped through language and thus lexically, that is, symbolically.⁵⁹ For Douglas, this meant that all cultural representations, not just language, influence the ways in which human beings know and interpret the world. The promise of such a theory was the potential to predict and explain the relationship between certain social dynamics and certain ways of seeing the world, thus providing a theory that consistently and reciprocally accounted for body, society and cosmology.

While Douglas made her own contribution to the field of biblical studies in her chapter on Levitical purity laws in *Purity and Danger*, Meeks introduced Douglas’ theory to a study of Pauline somatic comportment in his *First Urban Christians*. Stimulated by Douglas’ insight, “The human body is always treated as an image of society,”⁶⁰ Meeks inquires whether the abolition of the symbolic boundaries between Jew and Gentile

⁵⁶ M.L. Lyon and J.M. Barbalet, “Society’s Body: Emotion and the ‘Somatization’ of Social Theory,” in Csordas, *Embodiment*, 48-67, 54.

⁵⁷ Meredith B. McGuire, “Religion and the Body: Rematerializing the Human Body in the Social Sciences of Religion,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29 (3) (1990): 283-296, 284.

⁵⁸ *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge, 2002 [1966]).

⁵⁹ *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (New York: Routledge, 1996 [1973]), 21-38.

⁶⁰ Douglas, *Natural Symbols*, 98.

within the Christian groups possibly entailed the ambivalence of boundaries between the Christian sect and the world.⁶¹ After all, the disagreement over direct or indirect participation in Graeco-Roman temple meals among the ‘Strong’ and the ‘Weak’ in the Christian community, as evidenced in 1 Corinthians 8 and Romans 14, indicates that the various members of the group perceived its boundaries quite differently. According to Meeks, Paul understood purity in relation to the ritual life of the church; that is, the social cohesion fabricated by baptism has a counterpart, namely, the separation from the outside world.⁶² The ritual bath as that by which the community is ‘washed’ and ‘sanctified’ by definition forges a ‘clean/unclean’ social binary. The ritual meal, too, provided a new means by which the sacred and profane were distinguished. It was no longer an issue of particular foods that rendered one ‘unclean’, as was the case within the social boundedness of Jewish communities and their carefully prescribed food regulations. Now, under the guidance of Paul, it was infractions against the social cohesion of the community, in “not discerning the Lord’s body” (1 Cor 11:29f.), that made one vulnerable to physical illness or even death, thus establishing the purity of the community as over against particular foods. Hence, the Corinthians are excoriated “not even to eat with such a one” who blatantly violates the community’s ethical obligations in Christ (1 Cor 5:11; cf. 2 Thess 3:14).⁶³

It is this ethical dimension of the body that features prominently in Jerome Neyrey’s 1990 work, *Paul, in Other Words*,⁶⁴ where Douglas’ theory provides a conceptual map for a Pauline symbolic universe. For Neyrey, the body “is perceived as a symbol of the social body. The patterns of order and control exercised over the social body are replicated in the way the physical body is ordered and controlled.”⁶⁵ Thus, the submission of the entire body for baptism would imprint, as it were, the social structure of the *ekklesia* upon the initiate. In 1 Corinthians 12, “Paul sees the anatomy of the body as a clear cipher for the taxonomy of the social body.”⁶⁶ By subjecting their bodies to baptism, initiates subjected the totality of themselves to a distinct social matrix by which their own

⁶¹ *First Urban*, 97.

⁶² *First Urban*, 102.

⁶³ Meeks, *First Urban*, 103.

⁶⁴ See, too, his “Body Language in 1 Corinthians: The Use of Anthropological Models for Understanding Paul and His Opponents.” *Semeia* 35 (1986): 129-70.

⁶⁵ *Paul*, 16.

⁶⁶ *Paul*, 137.

bodies would be defined, one that entails a definite hierarchy and authority that draws social and ethical lines upon the initiate. Thus, baptism functioned as a line of demarcation, a boundary or margin around the social and physical body to separate and protect the “holy from the sinful, light from dark, and Christ from Belial.”⁶⁷

A rather sophisticated and sustained use of ritual theory analysing the Pauline conception of body and space is Jorunn Økland’s 2004 study, *Women in Their Place*. Inspired by the 1986 work on sacred space and 1 Cor 11-14 by Stephen C. Barton⁶⁸ against the backdrop of Douglas’ and Neyrey’s contributions, Økland examines Paul’s comments on women in 1 Corinthians 11-14 as part of a wider gendered discourse of spatial arrangement and ritual performance that she terms ‘sacred space’. The premises and presuppositions of this discourse are reflective of conceptions of the universe prevalent in the ancient world where gender was a cosmic structure that was manifested epiphenomenally at the human level in terms of male and female. For Økland, sacred space in the Graeco-Roman world manifested this conception of the cosmos in diverse ways, with the reciprocity between cosmos and cult accounting for ritualised gender regulations. Mary Douglas is foundational here: Økland cites her analysis of Leviticus that interprets the prescribed dietary restrictions as microcosmically reflective of the acts of sacrifice that were taking place in the macrocosmic sanctuary in Jerusalem.⁶⁹ An example of such a micro/ macro somatic relationship in the Corinthian context is 1 Cor 6:15, where Paul uses language of purity and danger to express his concern that Christian men pollute the body of Christ through sexual contact with a prostitute.⁷⁰ With this pattern of the socially informed body in place, together with what she terms the presence of ‘temple-discourse’, Økland concludes that, for Paul and the Corinthian community, the sacred space generated by the gathering of the *ekklesia* in Corinth is itself partly generated and structured by the roles and clothing assumed by women, reflecting a cult/ gendered-cosmos reciprocity. Økland argues that Paul’s exhortations concerning women’s roles and ritual clothing in 1 Corinthians 11-14, far from representing a transtemporal gender code, structure and gender the Christian gathering as a particular

⁶⁷ *Paul*, 83.

⁶⁸ “Paul’s Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth,” *NTS* 32: 225-46.

⁶⁹ *Purity and Danger*, 58.

⁷⁰ *Women*, 133-34.

kind of space constructed through ritual, a ‘sanctuary space’.⁷¹ This way 1 Corinthians 11-14 forms part of a broader discourse of gender and ritual/ sanctuary space in early Roman Corinth.

1.2.2.1. The Generative and Expressive Body

The foregoing studies have made significant contributions to explaining the distinctly *somatic* nature of early Christian identity, specifically the ways in which the human body provides a microcosmic canvas for larger macrocosmic conceptions of the church and cosmos in Pauline communities. These studies, further, have foregrounded how the reciprocity of this micro/ macrocosmic relationship is forged particularly in the *ethical* significance of ritual life, thus echoing Durkheim’s emphasis on the moral obligation inherent in ritualised activities.

However, there has been an important development in embodiment theory that reveals the limitations of these studies. From the vantage point of embodiment and bodily comportment, Michael Jackson has faulted Mary Douglas for conceiving of the human body as merely a text upon which the wider social order is inscribed, “an object of understanding or an instrument of the rational mind, a kind of vehicle for the expression of a reified social rationality.”⁷² The theoretical fault here involves what is nothing less than the classic Cartesian mind/ body dualism, in this case, a semiotic/ somatic dualism, where a sign system distinct from the human body is somehow subsequently projected upon or imputed to the body. Jackson argues that the “subjugation of the bodily to the semantic is empirically untenable ... meaning should not be reduced to a sign which, as it were, lies on a separate plane outside the immediate domain of an act.”⁷³ Thomas Csordas concurs, seeing past studies of the body as having taken the mechanisms of embodiment for granted and in turn failing to appreciate that “the body is at the same time the original tool with which humans shape their world, and the original substance out of which the human world is shaped.”⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Women*, 6-38.

⁷² Michael Jackson, *Paths Toward a Clearing: Radical Empiricism and Ethnographic Inquiry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 123.

⁷³ *Paths*, 122.

⁷⁴ Csordas, “Introduction,” 6.

Along these lines, the body has been the object of scrutiny in Catherine Bell's ritualisation project. As part of her wider practice approach to ritual (see below), Bell argues that the goal of ritualisation is the production of what she calls a 'ritualised body' which is a variation on Bourdieu's concept of 'practical mastery'. This is where one gains a 'sense' of one's ritualised environment which is not a matter of "self-conscious knowledge of any explicit rules of ritual but is an implicit 'cultivated disposition'."⁷⁵ These dispositions both shape and are in turn shaped by their environment, producing a ritualised reciprocity between the body and the social climate:

the modeling of the body within a highly structured environment does not simply express inner states. Rather, it primarily acts to restructure bodies in the very doing of the acts themselves. Hence, required kneeling does not merely *communicate* subordination to the kneeler. For all intents and purposes, kneeling produces a subordinated kneeler in and through the act itself ... what we see in ritualization is not the mere display of subjective states or corporate values. Rather, we see an act of production – the production of a ritualized agent able to wield physically a scheme of subordination and insubordination.⁷⁶

What is important here is that the ritualised body is both *expressive* and *performative* of beliefs, ideas and values.⁷⁷ The body does not merely enact previously held notions or beliefs; the body is in fact active in constituting the identity it is said to express or reveal. This reciprocity between the expressive and the performative is an important corrective to the somatic studies of Paul surveyed above, which tend to bifurcate theological beliefs and ritual practices. By emphasising the social significance of ritual, Meeks largely discounts theological beliefs and apostolic ritual interpretations "unless we can be sure those [interpretations] were integral to the common understanding."⁷⁸ Neyrey's analysis of Paul's symbolic universe involves a six-fold taxonomy which in effect abstracts concepts such as purity, sin and cosmology from the ritualised mechanisms by which they are performatively generated.⁷⁹ And though Økland recognises the significance of ritual performance in the generation of sacred space, it is surprising that performance

⁷⁵ Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 98; cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 87-95, 118-20, 124.

⁷⁶ Bell, *Ritual*, 100.

⁷⁷ Cf. Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1988): 519-31 on the distinction between 'expressive' and 'performative' conceptions of the body.

⁷⁸ Meeks, *First Urban*, 154.

⁷⁹ Cf. Neyrey, *Paul*, 15.

theory is (ironically) absent from her analysis.⁸⁰ The study of the mechanisms of embodiment would thus require conceiving of the body as both the site for and the producer of semiosis, enabling the analyst to gain a better understanding of ethical, social and cosmic categories as they are both generated and expressed through bodily idioms.

1.2.3. Ritual as Social Practice

A third theme in the ritual reading of Paul has been the focus on ritual as a kind of social *practice*. Though a diverse field represented by such theorists as Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens and Theodore Schatzki, the basic premise is that practices are fundamental to all social phenomena. Practices as such are thus “the central social phenomenon by reference to which other social entities such as actions, institutions, and structures are to be understood.”⁸¹ The advantage that practice analysis brings to social theory is that it promises a *via media* between the more traditional individualist and wholist approaches to social interpretation. On the one hand, the acts and utterances that constitute practices are composed of individual performances; on the other, these performances take place and are intelligible only against the more or less stable background of other performances. Thus, the context earlier wholist theorists would have described as ‘culture’ or ‘social structure’ is now understood in terms of the constituents of practices, which are continuously reproduced through praxis and transmitted or passed down to new practioners.⁸²

This concern for a foundational competence or understanding rooted in social practices was extended to the field of ritual studies in the 1992 publication, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, by Catherine Bell, where she challenged what she perceived to be an arbitrary thought/ action dichotomy pervasive among scholars of ritual.⁸³ Her solution is to focus on the particular circumstances and cultural strategies that generate and differentiate activities from each other, observing how and why a person acts so as to give some activities a privileged status vis-à-vis others. Bell writes: “Rather than impose

⁸⁰ Relying almost solely on the work of Jonathan Z. Smith, Økland simply limits her analysis to nuanced observations that sacred space is taking place, overlooking the performative processes inherent in the Pauline data that indicate how such sacred space was generated and experienced.

⁸¹ Theodore R. Schatzki, *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 11.

⁸² Joseph Rouse, “Practice Theory,” in Turner and Risjord, *Philosophy*, 639-82, 645.

⁸³ Bell, *Ritual*, 31; cf. 13-54.

categories of what is or is not ritual, it may be more useful to look at how human activities establish and manipulate their own differentiation and purposes – in the very doing of the act within the context of other ways of acting.”⁸⁴ She thus uses the term ‘ritualisation’ “to draw attention to the way in which certain social actions strategically distinguish themselves in relation to other actions.”⁸⁵ Some of the main strategies of ritualisation are “the generation of a privileged opposition between ritualized and other activities and the production of ritualized agents through the generation of a structured environment experienced as molding the bodies acting within.”⁸⁶

Bell’s arguments have persuaded several Pauline scholars to examine early Christian ritual life in the context of the wider field of Graeco-Roman social practices. In an essay entitled “Elusive Coherence: Ritual and Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 10-11,” Stanley K. Stowers examines the Pauline ritual meal in light of the wider world of three Graeco-Roman meal traditions: the common domestic meal, meals involving animal sacrifice, and memorial meals for the dead.⁸⁷ The important point here is that the common meal provided a mutual idiom, a shared set of practical skills that, like a *lingua franca*, both transcended the particularities of the variegated ethnicities and cultures on the one hand and provided the possibility of articulating social boundaries and distinctions on the other. Looking at the Lord’s Supper in light of the domestic meal, Stowers draws from his earlier essay on Hellenistic sacrificial practices to demonstrate how the preparation of food at both home and temple in the Graeco-Roman context constructed gender and kinship, with women responsible for the cooking of bread at home while men were entrusted with the sacrifice of animals at home and in public.⁸⁸ Stowers then queries what appears to be a significant ambiguity in the Lord’s Supper at Corinth: Paul seems to have left the rest of the meal, between the two ritualised moments of bread and wine offerings, unspecified; what, then, if someone brought meat to the meal, more specifically, meat that had been sacrificed? Stowers concludes that we have here the possibility of mixed

⁸⁴ *Ritual*, 74.

⁸⁵ *Ritual*, 74.

⁸⁶ *Ritual*, 101; cf. 74-101, 220.

⁸⁷ “Elusive Coherence,” 74; cf. idem, “Kinds of Myth, Meals, and Power: Paul and the Corinthians,” in Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller (eds), *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 105-50.

⁸⁸ “Elusive Coherence,” 74; cf. Stanley K. Stowers, “Greeks Who Sacrifice and Those Who Do Not: Toward an Anthropology of Greek Religion,” in L.M. White and O.L. Yarbrough (eds.), *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 293-333.

signals where the meal that was to be set apart from the ‘table of demons’ at Graeco-Roman temples was now introducing essential elements from those feasts. Stowers argues that the presence of meat at the Lord’s Supper may in fact account for the social dynamics behind what Paul described as the Corinthians’ ‘own dinner’ that they ought to eat at home (1 Cor 11:21-22), since it is the bread that embodies the unity of their shared lifeworld (1 Cor 11:29; cf. 10:17).⁸⁹

In another essay, “What is ‘Pauline Participation in Christ’?” Stowers links the Pauline conception of incorporation into Christ with the ritual washings practiced among Christians. In doing so, he turns to the world of Graeco-Roman physics to understand Paul’s use of the term ‘pneuma’ (πνεῦμα) and its possible associations with this ritualised participation in Christ. Stowers argues that Paul’s thinking in 1 Cor 6:12-20 and 15:35-50 betrays exactly the kind of hierarchical physics and cosmology indicative of Stoicism.⁹⁰ Stowers suggests that, for Paul, humans participate in Adam because they share bodies consisting of the same physical material or stuff as Adam (15:42-49), while those who are identified with Christ participate in him “because they share with him the most sublime kind of pneuma, divine pneuma that he received in being resurrected from the dead.”⁹¹ In addition to the Corinthian context, the ritual washing in Galatians 3:26-28 provides another example of this pneumatic participation in Christ, but now as it relates to the genealogy of Abraham. Abraham and Jesus are related because they all share in the same stuff evidenced by their common faithfulness to God’s promises, representing the beginning and end of the God-ordained lineage which bears the promise of blessing. This blessing is passed on to the Gentiles by means of their sharing in God’s pneuma in baptism. “As Christ participated in Abraham and shared his stuff, so Gentiles who come to share the pneuma of Christ in baptism share in this contiguity back to Abraham and are thus seed of Abraham and coheirs as they participate in the stuff of Christ.”⁹²

By examining ritual acts among Christians as practices, Stowers is able to analyse and redscribe Christian rituals as part of a larger trans-local field that accounts for the

⁸⁹ “Elusive Coherence,” 76.

⁹⁰ “What is ‘Pauline Participation in Christ’?” in Fabian E. Udoh et al (eds.), *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 16; Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2008), 352-71, 355.

⁹¹ “Pauline Participation,” 356.

⁹² “Pauline Participation,” 359-60.

rationale and intelligibility of the practices. However, despite this theoretical integrity, his analysis is vulnerable to the same criticisms of the history-of-religions interpretive approach, imposing rather than discovering parallels to practices while overlooking the radical uniqueness of Christian rituals.

A performative analysis of the transformative efficacy of Pauline ritual has been the particular contribution of Ithamar Gruenwald, who, in his *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*, devotes a chapter to the application of performance theory to an analysis of early Christian ritual meals. Gruenwald understands each ritual as entailing its own ritual theory, where the unfolding of rituals in their processual modes, their sequential segmentation, constitutes the principles that give shape to the embedded ritual theory.⁹³ Gruenwald elaborates on this claim by observing how a distinctly Christian community is created by the two key ritual acts: the *blessing* of the cup and *breaking* of the bread.⁹⁴ The verbal ‘blessing’ of the cup alluded to by Paul in 1 Corinthians 10 involves what Gruenwald considers an element of intentionality indicative of the mind working through the ritual, connecting the cup, the blood of Christ and the community by means of a verbal utterance or, in Gruenwald’s term, ‘verbal empowerment’.⁹⁵ While the wine remains wine, not blood, in the ritual, nevertheless it is not merely symbolic of blood; rather, the mimetic act in the context of the ritual utterance makes the wine “act as blood.”⁹⁶ Turning to the bread, the one gesture that appears explicit is the act of breaking (κλάω) in 10:16 and 11:24. Gruenwald proposes that the gesticulative breaking of the bread is that act which, counter-intuitively, brings about a transformation of a group of individuals into a community. This transformation involves a “preliminary stage of annihilation (the breaking of the bread), before re-generation becomes possible (creating the totality of the community that shares in the bread and is consequently reunited by and through the ritually reassembled pieces of the bread).”⁹⁷

Gruenwald’s analysis offers unique and fresh insights into the dynamics and significance of the Lord’s Supper. Unfortunately, his insistence on a solely sequential analysis of the ritual obscures the Corinthian texts. For example, his analysis of 1

⁹³ Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 5.

⁹⁴ Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 253.

⁹⁵ Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 252-3.

⁹⁶ Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 253.

⁹⁷ *Rituals*, 249; 256-7.

Corinthians 10 insists that the breaking of the bread must by necessity of the ritual logic follow from the blessing of the cup.⁹⁸ Gruenwald is well aware that this sequence is contradicted in 1 Corinthians 11, and yet he does not provide a solution to the supposed necessity of the first sequence as over against the second.

In 2008, Richard E. DeMaris published *The New Testament in Its Ritual World* which seeks to provide an analytic corrective to a trend among biblical scholars that tends to jettison the palpable characteristics of a rite in favor of getting to a more basic referential meaning.⁹⁹ Following ritual theorists such as Ronald Grimes, Roy Rappaport and Jonathan Z. Smith, DeMaris seeks explicitly to avoid “interpretive frameworks that assume the referential or symbolic nature of rites” by recognising that rites are “generative and creative – as having a life of their own” as opposed to “derivative and ancillary.”¹⁰⁰ DeMaris’ analytical corrective is particularly critical of the work of Meeks on Pauline baptism. For DeMaris, Meeks’ categorisation of baptism as an ‘initiation’ is problematic since it has the potential inadvertently to reshape the baptism texts in accordance with the tripartite rite of passage structure of separation, liminal transition and incorporation, a sequential etic classification extrinsic to Paul’s concerns.¹⁰¹ DeMaris makes the interesting observation that the author of the concept of liminality who factors so much in Meeks’ analysis of baptism, Victor Turner, did not himself consider baptism to be an example of liminality. Alternatively, DeMaris sees baptism as a “boundary crossing ritual” which seeks to ameliorate situations of community and/or individual crisis. For DeMaris, the “profound crisis that provided the social context of baptism was the breaking of natural family ties at conversion.”¹⁰² Baptism in this case would function as a “traditionalizing instrument,” normalizing the extraordinary in situations of tension.¹⁰³

At Corinth specifically, DeMaris speculates that there may be a distinctly counter-imperial significance inherent in early Christian baptism, citing Nicholas Purcell’s 1996 study of Roman water management which reveals that the Romans saw in their aquatic

⁹⁸ Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 255.

⁹⁹ Richard E. DeMaris, *The New Testament in Its Ritual World* (London/New York: Routledge, 2008), 7.

¹⁰⁰ *New Testament*, 8.

¹⁰¹ *New Testament*, 14-21.

¹⁰² *New Testament*, 27.

¹⁰³ *New Testament*, 34.

achievements an index of Roman power over nature. Situated within this “hydraulic landscape,” baptism in the Corinthian *ekklesia* can be interpreted as a ritualised resistance “to Roman hegemonic control of water, expressed in the proliferation of baths, aqueducts, and nymphaea in Corinth and through the Mediterranean world.”¹⁰⁴ DeMaris further criticizes Meeks’ categorisation of baptism for the dead as an ‘unknown and controverted ritual’ in contrast to the ‘major rituals’ of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, noting that van Gennep observed an interrelationship between rituals marking birth, marriage, and death as involving “potent metaphors for one another.”¹⁰⁵ DeMaris extends the burial motif associated with baptism in Romans 6 to the ubiquitous concern for the dead across the Graeco-Roman world, which involved primarily an obligation of the living for integrating the deceased into the realm of the dead. DeMaris surmises that had Corinthian religion of the Roman era not been preoccupied with the realm of the dead, “the Corinthian church would not have instituted baptism on behalf of the dead.”¹⁰⁶

DeMaris provides us with a culturally rich reading of the Pauline ritual texts, and his insightful exposition on the obscure death ritual in 1 Cor 15:29 demonstrates the exegetical advantages ritual theory may contain in interpreting problematic texts. However, there are several loose ends in his study. First, his exegesis of the texts in question is very thin. In fact, his categorising of baptism as a “boundary crossing ritual” which seeks to ameliorate situations of community and/or individual crisis, admittedly has no explicit exegetical evidence.¹⁰⁷ Secondly, DeMaris’ rejection of the rite of passage sequence for baptism actually comes back to haunt him with his analysis of baptism for the dead in 1 Cor 15:29. DeMaris invokes van Gennep’s observation that rites marking birth, marriage and death reciprocally interpret one another often through a shared semiotic, such that a funeral can in fact be a logical extension of baptism. Yet DeMaris does not seem to recognise that his rejection of the rite of passage sequence for baptism would cede the *rite of passage* relation between birth and death as observed by van Gennep. If DeMaris is arguing that the ‘death/rebirth’ semiotic inherent in baptism has a ritual life independent of the rite of passage structure, he is going beyond what van Gennep proposed. Or, one could inquire as to whether this connection between baptism

¹⁰⁴ *New Testament*, 49-50.

¹⁰⁵ *New Testament*, 60.

¹⁰⁶ *New Testament*, 80.

¹⁰⁷ *New Testament*, 24.

and funerals in fact corroborates that baptism was in fact an initiation, a rite of passage ritual that DeMaris has rejected.

1.3. Assessing the Field

The three major approaches highlighted above provide both the rationales for and the exegetical and social insights from theoretical attention to rituals practiced by the earliest Christians. Though diverse in theory, evidence and conclusion, they collectively demonstrate that rituals were indispensable to Paul's understanding of the creation, maintenance and development of a distinctly Christian community and identity. We are now in a position to assess these proposals by identifying the gaps that remain unresolved in such readings and the questions that I wish to pursue in the present study.

1. Recent theories on the body and practice as foundational to human thought and action exposed a thought/ act binary in Pauline studies. Specifically, we found that scholars interpret the ritualised body as *expressive* of Christian beliefs, ideas and values while overlooking the *generative* significance of the ritualised body for the very existence of those concepts. The gospel/ ritual dichotomy in particular is well represented in the history of Pauline interpretation, as evident in the dialectic posed by Rudolph Bultmann: "But what is the relation between incorporation into the Church by the sacrament of *baptism* and the dynamic process in which the salvation-occurrence continues itself through the proclaimed *word*?"¹⁰⁸ This word/ sacrament dialectic represents a historically Protestant discomfort with equating Christianity with ritual practices, which can itself be considered a particular instantiation of the priority of the spirit or soul over the body rooted in the classical tradition. Given that the Protestant Reformation became institutionalised in many of the confessional faculties of nineteenth-century Europe, it is not surprising that the theory/ practice, mind/ body dichotomy made its way into anthropological and sociological analysis as well, as per Catherine Bell's critique above.¹⁰⁹ Hence, both denominational and theoretical biases combine in socio-functional readings of Paul that perceive ritual activity among nascent Christians as enacting or expressing prior beliefs, ideas and values which are used as the basis of interpreting the

¹⁰⁸ Rudolph Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (ET by Kendrick Grobel; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 311.

¹⁰⁹ Stanley K. Stowers, "Pauline Scholarship and The Third Way in Social Theory," (unpublished manuscript).

rituals themselves. It is precisely this binary that ritual practice and performance theories call into question. Therefore, we shall have to reassess the socio-functionalist tendency to give priority to the cognitive, which requires a reconsideration of the relationship between Pauline ritual practices and the proclamation of the gospel and faith in Christ. If ritual practice is foundational to the experience, knowledge and identity specific to Pauline myth and performance, then the relationship between gospel and performance, faith and ritual, will need to be reevaluated.

2. The importance of time and space in Pauline ritualisation has been foregrounded by Strecker's study of the Lord's Supper and Økland's ritual account of the Pauline conception of gender. While the significance of space appears to be new ground broken by an anthropological reading of Paul, the temporal dimension of Pauline thought was notably the object of investigation by Bultmann, arguing that Paul's conception of apocalyptic eschatology, in contrast to Jewish sensibilities, was anthropological rather than cosmological. For Paul, world history, which was the arena for Jewish eschatology, had in fact been "swallowed up" by the Christ-event, transferring eschatological significance from the historical arena to a continuous present grounded in the individual human person.¹¹⁰ Ernst Käsemann, contra Bultmann, believed that Jewish apocalyptic, understood as the great historical drama of eschatological events, "was the mother of all Christian theology," a theme developed as an integrating motif for Pauline thought most notably by J. Christiaan Beker.¹¹¹ Given the relevance of rituals for the creation of time and periodicity, our understanding of Paul's perplexing conception of time may benefit from the kind of scholarly analysis that the field of ritual studies facilitates.

3. Both Strecker and Stowers have underscored how participation in Christian ritual performance engenders the question regarding the relationship of such rituals to Paul's pneumatology and the Christian's 'participation in Christ'. The publications of Albert Schweitzer's *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* in 1930 and E.P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* in 1977 made the compelling case that the believer's participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, in distinction from the believer's forensic status,

¹¹⁰ Rudolph Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," in *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. R.H. Fuller (London: SPCK, 1953), 1:5.

¹¹¹ E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," in idem, *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W.J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 102; J.C. Beker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

belongs at the centre of Paul's theological universe. However, as Stowers has observed, while there has been a wide acceptance among scholars for the centrality of participation in Pauline thought, there is no agreement on precisely what such participation entails, especially in relation to Paul's pneumatology.¹¹² Given that Schweitzer located the phenomenon of pneumatic participation in the sacramental life of the Pauline churches, particularly baptism, a ritual framework may provide the very theoretical and sociological integrity needed for ascertaining the nature of this theme in the Pauline corpus.

4. A number of the works surveyed above have followed Mary Douglas's model of cosmological and ethical correspondence between the social body and the physical body. For example, both Meeks and Neyrey observed how baptism functioned as a line of demarcation, a boundary or margin around both the social and physical bodies that marked Christians as a distinct group. And yet, the matter of Paul's ethics, like his conception of time, has been the subject of a number of inquiries throughout the history of critical interpretation. Bultmann, in his "The Problem of Ethics in Paul," extended what he considered Paul's anthropological eschatology into his paradoxical indicative-imperative formulations, and in doing so set the stage for a century of scholarly investigation into the nature of Pauline ethics.¹¹³ As explained above, Durkheim's observation that social obligation was inherent in and originated with a community's ritual life has been widely accepted among ritual scholars, and it thus appears that ritual studies provide resources for a fresh investigation into the nature of ethics and the physical/ social body in Paul.

1.4. Ritual Theory and Procedure

Our assessment of the current state of ritual studies and Pauline scholarship elicited four questions that we shall pursue throughout the study. These four questions require a ritual theory that not only addresses the areas that remain unresolved in Pauline scholarship, but also attends to those aspects of ritual that have been overlooked by ritual theorists. We noted above that socio-functional ritual analyses often involve a degree of ambivalence to the extent that they fail to make a functionalist/ selectionist distinction:

¹¹² Stowers, "Pauline Participation," 352.

¹¹³ Rudolf Bultmann, "The Problem of Ethics in Paul," in Brian S. Rosner (ed.), *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches* (trans. Christoph W. Stenschke; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 195-216.

scholars often attribute a ritual cause to a social effect without demonstrating that the ritual exists in order to bring about that particular social effect. And even if the functionalist/ selectionist distinction is maintained, socio-functional analyses fail to account for why ritual is particularly apt or uniquely qualified for achieving the ends ascribed to them. Moreover, we found above that embodiment theorists have tended to err by making too sharp a distinction between the semiotic and the somatic. While the human body does indeed express symbol systems, the body is also generative and formative of those symbol systems. The body does not simply enact previously existing cogitations or beliefs, but is also integral to the formation and maintenance of such cogitations and beliefs.

We are therefore in agreement with performance- and practice-based theories and their emphasis on the role of the ritualised body in the formation of social order. Social dynamics and the knowledge forged therein are constituted by and around the physical body in practices properly basic, foundational, to human experience, knowledge and identity. The ritualised body thus mediates the social arrangement of time and space in ways that are specific to the structural relations of the constituent elements inherent in ritualised activity. The delineation and disambiguation of these structural relations has been the sustained analysis of the American ecological anthropologist, Roy A. Rappaport, who proposes that rituals provide ‘cybernetic’ (i.e. self-regulating) controls necessary for the adaptive systems of cultures.¹¹⁴ According to Rappaport, all cultures respond to perturbations or disturbances in their social equilibrium with what he terms ‘cognized environments’, ritually organised meaning systems that enable cultures to interpret and thus respond to the challenges posed by their ecologies and/or social contexts. These ritually organised meaning systems involve primary sacred values, what Rappaport terms ‘ultimate sacred postulates’, which inform cosmological and temporal conceptions that in turn certify and legitimate social order and ethics. Ritualised activities in effect calibrate social and ethical life around sacred and cosmic conceptions and thereby establish

¹¹⁴ Roy A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); idem, “Ritual, Sanctity, and Cybernetics,” *American Anthropologist* 73 (1971): 59-76. For an analysis of Rappaport’s work in relation to an historical overview of ritual studies, see Ellen Messer and Michael Lambek, *Ecology and the Sacred: Engaging the Anthropology of Roy A. Rappaport* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001).

cultural conventions and socially normative behaviour. It is through such ritualised calibration that cultural perturbations are both recognised and countered.

What is important for our study is that Rappaport's theory addresses each one of the gaps that we identified in our survey of ritual readings of Paul:

- (i) Rappaport observes that ritual involves both form and embodiment: "As a form or structure it possesses certain logical properties, but its properties are not only logical. Inasmuch as performance is one of its general features, it possesses the properties of practice as well. In ritual, logic becomes enacted and embodied – is realized – in unique ways."¹¹⁵ For Rappaport, act and utterance, belief and practice, are dialectically reciprocal and thus irreducible to one another, in that rituals order and actualise the meaning systems shared by a population: "Liturgical orders impose structure upon understanding or, perhaps it is better to say, provide the structure without which understanding can only be fragmented and contradictory."¹¹⁶
- (ii) Rappaport argues that the structural relations between the constituents of ritual form and performance entail a highly definite and unambiguous periodicity that calibrates time in ways unique to ritualised processes.¹¹⁷
- (iii) The reciprocity of logic and performance in ritual involves two classes of messages transmitted through ritual processes: the performative element produces what Rappaport terms 'self-referential' messages, and the logical element produces 'canonical' messages.¹¹⁸ Self-referential messages transmit variant information concerning the participant's own status to herself and to other participants, while canonical messages transmit information of transcendence encoded in invariant orders of liturgy and communicated by the participants. As the Hebrew *Shema* remains unchanged on the lips of constantly changing confessors, ritual uniquely merges the transcendent (often associated with the discursive) with the specific (the physical, embodied),

¹¹⁵ *Ritual*, 3.

¹¹⁶ Roy A. Rappaport, "On Cognized Models," in idem, *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion* (Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979), 97-144, 117.

¹¹⁷ *Ritual*, 169-215.

¹¹⁸ *Ritual*, 52-4.

relating a sacred transcendent order to the variegated participants who by their ritual performance realise such order.

- (iv) Finally, the ritualised mechanisms of embodiment entail for Rappaport a highly ethical dimension. The formal and public nature of ritual participation make it clear that an act of acceptance of the canonical messages communicated in their ritualised activity is taking place, in that it would be contradictory and therefore impossible for ritual participants to reject the messages that are being realised through their own ritualised embodiment.¹¹⁹ Through ritualised acceptance, the performers have obliged themselves to fidelity toward that which was accepted, and thus moral obligation is implicit in ritual's structure.¹²⁰

Rappaport presents a sustained analysis of the formal properties and relationships constitutive of ritualised processes of performance and embodiment that address the four questions we wish to pursue in our study. Rappaport's theory will be applied heuristically to the two main rituals that identified Pauline Christian communities: ritual washings and ritual meals. Our investigation will concentrate on two of Paul's letters in particular: Galatians and 1 Corinthians. As will be demonstrated, these two letters present the richest spread of evidence pertinent to our ritual theory as summarised above.¹²¹ We shall proceed as follows: In Part II, we shall devote five chapters to an analysis of ritual washings in Paul. Chapter 2 will examine ritual washing in Gal 3:26-29, while chapters 3, 4 and 5 will explore ritual washings in 1 Cor 1:10-17, 6:9-11 and 12:13 respectively. Chapter 6 will present the main conclusions for Part II. In Part III, we shall investigate Pauline ritual meals. Chapter 7 will examine the Antiochene meals in Gal 2:11-21. Chapter 8 will analyse the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11:17-34 as it pertains to the eating of food sacrificed to idols in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1. Chapter 9 will present our conclusions for Part III. Our final chapter will present the main conclusions of this study.

1.5. Summary

¹¹⁹ *Ritual*, 119.

¹²⁰ *Ritual*, 132.

¹²¹ While baptism in Romans 6 will be alluded to in Part II, I will not give it a separate analysis both for reasons of space and because it is less informative about the performative aspects of baptism which are most important for the type of ritual analysis I am pursuing.

Over the last few decades, the interface between ritual studies and Pauline scholarship has proven to be highly effective in shedding fresh light on Pauline conceptions of community, time, the relation between the social body and the physical body, social order and ethics. The diversity in theoretical approach evidences both strengths and weaknesses in ritual reconstructions of early Christian communities. Having identified the gaps in these studies, we turned to recent developments in performance- and practice-based theories as they were particularly integrated in the work of Roy Rappaport, which promise new insights into the generative and expressive processes involved in the formation and maintenance of the emerging Christian social world.

Part II

Paul and Ritual Washings

Ritual Washing in Galatians: Time, Body and Social Order

2.1. Introduction

One does not have to read very far into Galatians to be impressed by Paul's sense of urgency towards the churches he founded as the apostle to the Gentiles (1:6; cf. 4:13-19; Acts 13-14).¹²² Indeed, in the place of his customary thanksgiving, Paul rebukes the Galatians.¹²³ It appears that they have allowed certain 'agitators'¹²⁴ to come into their community, 'disturbing' them (οἱ ταρασσόντες, 1:7; 5:10) with what Paul calls an ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον (1:6). As a result, the Galatians are now 'quickly turning away' (ταχέως μετατίθημι) to another gospel (1:6-10; cf. 1:8-9; 3:1-5; 4:11-20; 5:7-12), so that the churches which once received Paul 'as an angel, as Christ Jesus' himself (4:14), are now abandoning the one who labored over them as his own children (4:19).¹²⁵

This occasion for Paul's polemic against the so-called 'agitators' serves as the backdrop for what may be the earliest extant reference to the Christian ritual of baptism:¹²⁶

Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε: οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἑλλήνι, οὐκ ἐν δοῦλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ: πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

¹²² On Paul's founding of the Galatian churches, see James M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: the Old Testament and Jewish background of Paul's mission to the nations with special reference to the destination of Galatians* (WUNT 84, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995), 188f; Nicholas H. Taylor, "Paul's Apostolic Legitimacy: Autobiographical Reconstruction in Gal 1:11-2:14," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 83 (June 1993): 68; G. Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography: Towards a New Understanding*, SBLDS 73 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 126; Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 10-11.

¹²³ Charles H. Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 27 refers to 1:6-10 as a 'thanksgiving parody'. Cf. Paul's normal practice of greeting churches with a word of thanksgiving in Rom 1:8f; 1 Cor 1:4f; Phil 1:3f; Col 1:3f; 1 Thess 1:2f; etc. Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990), 38-39.

¹²⁴ For a profile of Paul's opponents, see J.M.G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73-93.

¹²⁵ See Lyons, *Pauline*, 126-127, who observes that the present tense verbs in 1:6-7; 3:3; 4:16-18, 21, etc., suggest that the Galatians are in the process of desertion "and that the final step has not yet been taken" (cf. 3:3-5; 4:8-11). So, too, Betz, *Galatians*, 47.

¹²⁶ On the date of Galatians (circa 50-55 CE), see, e.g., C.H. Buck, "The Date of Galatians," *JBL* 70 (1951): 113-22; D.B. Knox, "The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians," *EvQ* XIII (1941): 262-8; Lars Hartman, *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 1.

εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.
(Gal 3:26-29)

The passage is situated rhetorically at the heart of what Betz analysed as the *probatio* or proof section of the letter (3:1-4:31).¹²⁷ In a speech, the *probatio* or *confirmatio* section presents the evidence upon which the success of the argument depends, and is thus considered the most important of the various parts or rounds of proof.¹²⁸ For Betz, this meant that the allusion to the baptism ritual serves logically to connect 3:26-29 to the letter as a whole. What precisely this epistolary connection is, however, remained for Betz elusive.¹²⁹

There are three broad issues involved in interpreting this passage. First, there is the question of whether this pericope is evidence of a Pauline or pre-Pauline baptismal formula. Secondly, there is controversy over the relationship between πίστις in v. 26 and βαπτίζειν in v. 27 with regard to the Galatians' soteriological status ἐν Χριστῷ. Thirdly, there is a wide spectrum of scholarly opinion as to the precise nature of the abrogated binaries in 3:28a and how they fit into the logic of Paul's argument. I shall examine each of these issues in turn and demonstrate how a ritual reading of the text offers explanatory resolutions to these controversies in a way that interrelates each one of the scholarly issues at hand, demonstrating a logical interdependence between baptism, body and social order. I shall argue that baptism in Galatians is presented by Paul as an apocalyptic ritual that generates performatively a spatio-temporal dualism of 'this world' and 'the world to come' / 'the new creation' located on the space of the baptised body, which in turn entails a concomitantly apocalyptic social orientation. It is thus the ritualised relationship between time, somatic space and social order that accounts for the logic of the text.

2.2. Tradition-Formula and Performatives in Galatians 3:26-29

¹²⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, 181. Cf. the rhetorical outline of the letter in Ben Witherington, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 34-5. For an overview of the scholarly debates concerning the rhetorical structure and genre of Galatians, see Robert G. Hall, "Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Tradition," *NTS* 42 (1996): 434-53.

¹²⁸ Betz, *Galatians*, 128.

¹²⁹ *Galatians*, 186.

The current scholarly consensus is that these verses do not originate with Paul but rather comprise an early Christian baptismal liturgy or saying.¹³⁰ There are several reasons many scholars believe that Paul is here quoting a baptismal formula used by either the churches at Galatia or churches throughout the Mediterranean. There are conspicuous verbal and conceptual parallels between Gal 3:27-28, 1 Cor 12:13 and Col 3:10-11, such as the motifs of baptism into ‘Christ’ or ‘one body’, the listing of two or more pairs of opposites which are now dissolved as the result of baptism, and an appeal to unity, all of which suggest that the verbal and conceptual indicators in Gal 3:26-29 are not specific to congregations in Galatia. There are also parallels in terms of how each passage stands out from its epistolary context. In 1 Cor 12:13, the terms ‘slave or free’ are not connected to the substance of Paul’s argument in chapters 12-14. Similarly, in Gal 3:28, the phrase ‘male and female’ (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) is not connected to any of Paul’s themes in the rest of Galatians. Moreover, there is a change from first person plural in Gal 3:25 (ἐσμεν) to second person plural in verses 26-29 (ἐστε), signifying a declaration to a group in contrast to the surrounding argument.

There have been of late a few prominent dissenters from the majority opinion. James Dunn is skeptical of the claim to a baptismal tradition based on what he sees as ambiguous criteria and the lack of evidence for the existence of such elaborate rites.¹³¹ Dunn in fact is unconvinced that the pericope is denoting the act of ritual washing, noting that the complementary phrase Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε in v. 27b can be repeated while baptism is not: “‘To put on Christ’ is simply a figurative usage to describe more expressively the spiritual transformation which makes one a Christian.”¹³² Richard Hays, too, doubts whether Gal 3:27-28 is a baptismal quotation, since baptism was ‘in the name

¹³⁰ See, e.g., Pauline Nigh Hogan, “No Longer Male and Female”: *Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*, (Library of New Testament Studies, New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 22-25; Wayne Meeks, “The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,” *History of Religions* 13 (1973): 165-208; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, Anchor Bible 33A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 373-83; Betz, *Galatians*, 181-5; Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 41 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 155, 159; Atsuhiko Asano, *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological, and Socio-Historical Studies* (JSNTSup, 285, London: T&T Clark, 2005), 181-2; D. MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 4-9; Gerhard Barth, *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 49-59.

¹³¹ James D.G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 201. Cf. Franz Mussner, *Der Galaterbrief* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1974), 262-3.

¹³² James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (London: SCM Press, 1970), 110.

of Jesus Christ' (Acts 2:38; 1 Cor 6:11); the absence of such a formula indicates that Paul is here interpreting the significance of baptism which, parallel with Romans 6, is signifying 'union with Christ'.¹³³ Perhaps the boldest dissent comes from Ben Witherington, who reads Gal 3:27 in light of a conversion-baptism dichotomy he derives from 1 Cor 12:13 and 1 Cor 1:10-17. "The real question," Witherington writes, "to be raised about vs. 27, however, is whether Paul is actually talking about what happens through or in the rite of baptism or whether Paul is using baptismal language to refer to what happens in conversion, a spiritual event of which baptism is only the appropriate symbol."¹³⁴ Witherington argues that βαπτίζειν is used *metaphorically* by Paul in Gal 3:27 to describe their shared experience of the Spirit by appealing, first, to Paul's express statement in 1 Cor 12:13 that all believers have been baptised into one Spirit and, second, to Paul's rather ambivalent, perhaps even unflattering, attitude toward baptism as evidenced in 1 Cor 1:10-17, thus concluding: "It is the Spirit, not water baptism that joins a person to the body of Christ."¹³⁵

While the specific issue of a metaphoric baptism in Paul will be explored in detail in our analysis of 1 Cor 12:13 below, there are two related indicators in Gal 3:26-29 that weigh heavily in favor of interpreting the passage as a denotation of the baptism ritual, namely, *performative* and *social* indicators.

Several scholars have recognised the distinctly performative characteristics in this passage. Meeks initially interpreted the declarative features of the pericope (cf. 'You are now all sons of God') as performatives in his highly influential article which laid out the synoptic parallels between Gal 3:26-29, 1 Cor 12:13 and Col 3:9-11, commenting that as
a

solemn ritual pronouncement ... such a declaration would carry – within the community for which its language was meaningful – the power to assist in shaping the symbolic universe by which that group distinguished itself from the ordinary 'world' of the larger society. A modern philosopher might call it a 'performative utterance'. So long as it is spoken validly, as perceived within the community's

¹³³ Richard B. Hays, *The Letter to the Galatians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. The New Interpreter's Bible: Second Corinthians – Philemon*, Vol. 11 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 183-348, 271.

¹³⁴ Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (London, New York: T&T Clark, 1998), 276.

¹³⁵ *Grace in Galatia*, 276. Dunn's and Witherington's position has been most recently advocated by Debbie Hunn, "The Baptism of Galatians 3:27: A Contextual Approach" *The Expository Times* (August 2004): 372-75.

accepted norms of order, it does what it says. Thus, though we might suppose that the only possible realistic function of such language would be to inculcate an attitude, the form of the statement is not ‘you ought to think ...,’ but ‘there is ...’ A factual claim is being made, about an ‘objective’ change in reality that fundamentally modifies social roles.¹³⁶

Betz follows suit by observing that Paul’s proclamation in 3:28a dissolving ethnic, social and sexual binaries “*promises or proclaims* the unity of mankind...”¹³⁷ Mary Rose D’Angelo has also seized on the performative characteristics of the passage in order to propose a solution to supposed inconsistencies in Paul’s dicta on women.¹³⁸ However, in light of the inversion of social-norms in 3:28a, it is surprising that none of these scholars pursued how performatives function to *establish* social conventions. For example, while Meeks recognised the efficacy of performatives “within the community’s accepted norms of order,” he did not pursue how performatives contribute to enacting and perpetuating that order. It is this relationship between the performative and the establishment of social norms that I would like to pursue and then determine the extent to which such a relationship is evident in our text.

The term ‘performative’ derives from what philosophers over the last few decades have delineated as distinct characteristics inherent in human speech, characteristics termed ‘performative utterances’ and ‘illocutionary acts’ by J.L. Austin, and ‘speech acts’ by J.R. Searle.¹³⁹ The peculiar characteristic that has attracted attention is the creative or generative quality of performative utterances. All performative utterances have in common the “aim to *bring about*, not simply describe, the state of affairs they represent and that constitutes their propositional content.”¹⁴⁰ Austin referred to this creative dimension in performative utterances as their “illocutionary” effect; that is, performatives achieve their effect *in* their very utterance, such that their utterance entails an effect (e.g.

¹³⁶ Meeks, “Image,” 182.

¹³⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, 192, emphasis added.

¹³⁸ Mary Rose D’Angelo, “Gender Refusers in the Early Christian Mission: Gal 3:28 as an Interpretation of Gen 1:27b,” in Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke (eds), *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series Vol. 14; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 149-73.

¹³⁹ J. L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962; J.R. Searle, *Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

¹⁴⁰ François Recanati, *Meaning and Force: The Pragmatics of Performative Utterances* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 169.

“I warn you,” or “I promise you”).¹⁴¹ Thus, speech acts or performative utterances, do not so much correspond to reality, as do the reporting nature of what Austin called “constatives,” that is, statements or reports, the truthfulness of which is determined by the degree of correspondence to a reality objective and previous to the statements.¹⁴² Rather, performatives generate reality; they create a state of affairs the truthfulness of which is an inherent property of the speech itself. As such, performatives function as the inverse of the correspondence theory of truth.¹⁴³ The utterances that transform a prince into a king, dub a knight, bestow manhood upon a Marring boy through supercision, or pronounce newlywed status upon the betrothed do not entail statements considered true because they report a previously existing state of affairs; rather, these states of affairs are considered true to the degree to which they conform to the ritualised utterances.¹⁴⁴ Said differently, performative utterances or speech acts are conventional linguistic procedures for the establishment of conventional norms (cf. “I now pronounce you ...”).¹⁴⁵

As the above examples suggest, ritual is full not only of performative *utterances* but also performative *acts*. Performatives are thus not limited to the linguistic, but involve kinds of concrete practice set apart from mundane or quotidian life by virtue of their distinctively creative or generative qualities.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, scholars have been increasingly drawn to the role of the human body for the efficacy of performatives. Austin observed that the illocutionary force of expressions – their efficacy in generating a state of affairs – presupposes a socially accepted institution whereby such words are uttered by properly authorised persons under proper circumstances. But while Austin recognised that performatives were “conventional procedures” contingent upon accepted institutions,

¹⁴¹ Austin, *How to do*, 130. An important distinction is made by Austin between “illocutionary” and “perlocutionary” acts, noting that the former (e.g. “I warn you that”) is not the same as the latter (e.g. “I convince you that”). While illocutionary force achieves its effect in the actual utterance, perlocutionary force involves *persuasion* on the part of the auditor. An illocutionary act (e.g. “I promise you”) entails an effect irrespective of its persuasive or perlocutionary force. See Austin, *How to do*, 94-108.

¹⁴² Austin, *How to do*, 3, *passim*.

¹⁴³ The correspondence theory of truth asserts the facts, events or situations to which a statement refers presumably exist independent of and previous to the statement referring to them, with assessment of truth or facticity in a statement contingent upon its agreement in some sufficient degree to those previously existing and independent states of affairs. “The state of affairs is the criterion by which the truth, accuracy or adequacy of a statement is assessed” (Rappaport, *Ritual*, 117, 132).

¹⁴⁴ *Ritual*, 132.

¹⁴⁵ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 57.

¹⁴⁶ Klause-Peter Köpping, *et al*, (eds), *Ritual and Identity: Performative Practices as Effective Transformations of Social Reality* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006), 17.

Austin never examined in detail the nature of these conventions and gave only scant attention to how these conventions could be established.¹⁴⁷ Rappaport, along with Catherine Bell and Judith Butler, locates the illocutionary efficacy of performatives in the acceptance demonstrated by the human body.¹⁴⁸ For Rappaport, the structure of ritual is “circular,” in that the authority inherent in ritual transformations is ultimately contingent upon its acceptance by those presumably subject to it, such that the plausibility of the state of affairs generated by a ritual is directly proportionate to the fidelity invested by the performers in the ritual institution of which they are participants. This fidelity is established through bodily *performance*, in that because the ritual participant performs the messages encoded in the ritual, s/he in fact *embodies* and thus becomes identified with the messages communicated in the ritual, being infused with the sacred messages s/he both receives and transmits. To perform a ritual is necessarily to embody and thus participate in the sacred meaning communicated by its symbols, demonstrating personal acceptance of the ritual’s encoded messages and social order.¹⁴⁹ Thus, to “perform a liturgy is at one and the same time to conform to its order and to realize it or make it substantial. *Liturgical performance not only recognizes the authority of the conventions it represents, it gives them their very existence.*”¹⁵⁰

With the foregoing theory in mind, there are four indicators in our present pericope that satisfy these performative and conventional criteria:

First, performative verbs are usually in the present tense, since past tense statements like “I promised” are not performative but constative, merely reporting what has taken place in the past. It is therefore significant that most of the verbs in the declarative statements in 3:26-29 are in the present tense: ἐστε in v. 26, ἔνι (3x) and ἐστε in v. 27, and ἐστε in v. 28, while the two aorists, ἐβαπτίσθητε and ἐνεδύσασθε, denote the performance of baptism.

Secondly, while Paul’s usage of the construction βαπτίζειν εἰς does not necessitate a reference to the actual ritualised declaration of baptism εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (cf. βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν in 1 Cor 10:2), we cannot disregard the fact that one of the

¹⁴⁷ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 125.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Bell, *Ritual*, 100; Judith Butler, “Performativity’s Social Magic” in Richard Shusterman (ed.), *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*. Critical Readers (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 113-28

¹⁴⁹ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 119, italics in the original.

¹⁵⁰ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 125, emphasis original.

key distinctive features, if not *the* distinctive feature, of Christian baptisms was the verbal pronouncement of Christ's Lordship over the baptised (cf. 1 Cor 1:13-17; 6:11; Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5).¹⁵¹ It would thus be difficult to hear Paul's reference to all those who were baptised εἰς Χριστόν as anything less than an echo of that ritual pronouncement.

Thirdly, performatives, as explained above, involve the body as the location for the establishment of their acceptance. It is therefore significant that Paul complements his reference to baptism in 27a with a 'clothing' reference in 27b. This participatory significance would be corroborated by the phrase Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε in v. 27b. Most scholars see Paul's use of the verb ἐνδύω ('to put on something' or 'to clothe oneself with something')¹⁵² as paralleling or predicating βαπτίζω, in that the verbs are both second-person plural, aorist, βαπτίζω in the passive voice and ἐνδύω in the middle, and both are related to v. 26 in the same way.¹⁵³ The significance of the clothing reference would then be to approximate the Galatians' bodily relation to Christ which, in this case, involves being related to Christ in a manner analogous to the body's relation to its clothing.¹⁵⁴ The Jewish precedent for the 'clothing' metaphor would entail being adorned with Christ's characteristics, virtues and intentions (cf. the LXX precedent in 2 Chr 6:41; Job 29:14; Ps 131 [132]:9, 16, 18; Prov 31:23; Isa 51:9; 52:1; 61:10; Zech 3:3-5).¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ Scholars have tended to interpret the phrase εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε as an abbreviated form of βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; cf. Barth, *Taufe*, 44, 46; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 90-92; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 155. Others interpret the phrase as simply the amplification of the ἐν Χριστῷ motif throughout 3:26-29; cf. Dunn, *Galatians*, 203; Ronald Y.K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 172; Hays, *Galatians* 271. Our appropriation of the phrase as what is termed technically a 'frame' will be discussed below.

¹⁵² Oepke, "δύω κτλ." *TDNT* 2:319.

¹⁵³ See, e.g., Jung Hoon Kim, *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus* (JSNTSup, London: T&T Clark, 2004), 115; Fung, *Galatians*, 172; Barth, *Taufe*, 105; Betz, *Galatians*, 186; Mussner, *Galaterbrief*, 262-3; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 147-51; Oepke, "βάπτω, βαπτίζω," *TDNT* 1:539.

¹⁵⁴ Kim, *Significance of Clothing*, 115: "He [Paul] probably thinks that the closeness between a garment and its wearer could explain the intimate relationship between Christ and Christians. In a sense, a garment can be thought of as being part of its wearer. A garment always accompanies its wearer; where he or she is, there the garment is also. It shares everything that he or she experiences." Udo Borse, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1984), 138, observes: "Das Wasser legt sich um Körper wie eine zusätzliche Haut, wie ein hautenges Gewand. In analoger Weise sind die Gläubigen in das Element Christus hineingetaucht worden."

¹⁵⁵ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 156. It is difficult to determine whether the 'clothed with Christ' reference was originally a metaphor that gave rise to a practice of a post-baptismal clothing or the other way around (cf. the role of disrobing in the Hippolytus *Apostolic Tradition* 21). While Paul himself offers no explicit description of the initiate's clothing during or after the ritual washing, other Second Temple literature describes the attire for bathing, such as Josephus' description of the Essenes as bathing clothed with a loin cloth (*Bell* 2.128-129) or, in the case of females, wearing dresses (*Bell* 2.161). Josephus describes the

Fourthly, performatives provide the necessary precondition of acceptance of the establishment of social order. Hence we can see how the shared baptism ritual transitions naturally into a social world comprised of new relationships in v. 28, where Paul writes: οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἑλληνί, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ: πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. While Gal 3:28 is a notoriously difficult verse for the exegete, some of the complexities of which we shall explore below, at this stage it is sufficient to observe the emphasis on the unity, the oneness, that the Galatians share in Christ, as evident in the transformation of πάντες in v. 26 and 28b (cf. ὅσοι in v. 27) into εἷς in v. 28d.¹⁵⁶ Indeed, a number of commentators consider 3:28 to be an example of early Christian *communitas*: a stage in the ritual process that creates an often egalitarian context that is a microcosm of the larger egalitarian movements within social processes, perhaps reflective of a pre-tribal social order.¹⁵⁷ Meeks argues that Gal 3:26-28 is a ‘baptismal reunification formula’ that inspired more egalitarian practices in early Christianity, which he subsequently developed in terms of the ritual theory of Victor Turner.¹⁵⁸ Wedderburn notices that the reversal of values with which Paul describes Christian existence, and the transcending of distinctions, or opposites, which he sees as marking the new creation and the new age (Gal 3:28; 6:15), bears a surprising resemblance to some of the characteristics of ‘liminal’ or ‘marginal’ existence as described in anthropologists’ descriptions of rites of passage.¹⁵⁹ Liminality and *communitas* have featured most prominently in Strecker’s study, where he argues that Gal 3:28 evidences that the Pauline conception of community is one of “normative Communitas.”¹⁶⁰ Asano has recently argued that the Galatian community in particular and the Gentile mission in general “have been previously identified as a new entity, emerging from a previous structural context based upon a core ethnic sentiment into a state of permanent liminality ... In the [baptism] ritual, what was marginalized as anomalous

Essenes receiving white robes after bathing (*Bell* 2.137-142), while Aseneth is depicted as receiving a new linen robe after her ritual bath (*Jos. Asen.* 14:12-13). See Laurie Guy, “‘Naked’ Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality,” *Journal of Religious History* 27 (2—3): 133-42; J.Z. Smith “Garments of Shame,” *History of Religions* 5 (1966): 217–238.

¹⁵⁶ Yon-Gyong Kwon, *Eschatology in Galatians: Rethinking Paul’s Response to the Crisis in Galatia*, (WUNT 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 88; Hans-Joachim Eckstein, *Verheißung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15-4,7* (WUNT 86; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 220-22.

¹⁵⁷ Turner, *Ritual Process*, 94-165.

¹⁵⁸ Meeks, *First Urban*, 88, 155-7.

¹⁵⁹ *Baptism*, 386-7.

¹⁶⁰ Strecker, *Die liminale Theologie*, 300; 351-8.

human relatedness is turned into normality or authenticity by dissolving conventional social differentiations.”¹⁶¹ The important point here for our analysis is that the extent to which a *communitas* is realised by the Galatians or idealised by Paul is predicated on bodily-established acceptance specific to ritualised processes.

Thus the formal critical evidence combined with performative and social indicators corroborate that our present text references the *performance* of the baptism ritual. This means, contra Dunn and Witherington, that Paul is not merely using language associated with the ritual bath but is in fact drawing from frames of reference that *constitute* the ritual. The performative characteristics do not, however, necessitate that Paul is here referencing an actual formula used at the ritual washing¹⁶² or a deliberate abridgment of the phrase ‘baptism in the name of Jesus’; rather Paul appears to be referencing frames of reference that are specific to ritually generated meanings.¹⁶³ I would therefore see the performative characteristics in Gal 3:26-29 as evidencing what Gregory Bateson terms ‘frames’, that is, figures of speech, allusions to special formulae, appeals to tradition and references to ritualised gestures that key the listener/ observer in on how to interpret the messages that are communicated, whether in written or oral form.¹⁶⁴ These verbal, enacted and/or gesticulatory performatives constitute an interpretative frame within which the messages being communicated are to be understood and identified, with the performative indicators thus providing a distinct location for the generation of meaning.¹⁶⁵ From this vantage point, the baptismal reference imbues Paul’s speech with social, ethical and obligatory frames of reference and thus accomplishes what mere constatives (statements of fact) could not.

¹⁶¹ Asano, *Community-Identity*, 197.

¹⁶² Indeed, Campbell observes that the three binaries cited by Paul in 3:28a “summarize a Hellenistic ideology concerning human society attested at length in, for example, Aristotle’s *Politics*, but found vestigially in many other places as well, including Jewish prayers. So Paul is no more citing a liturgy or confession here than current reports of international politics speak of ‘East versus West’ or ‘North and South’.” See Douglas A. Campbell, “The Logic of Eschatology: The Implications of Paul’s Gospel for Gender as Suggested by Galatians 3.28a in Context,” in idem (ed.), *Gospel and Gender: A Trinitarian Engagement with being Male and Female in Christ* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 58-81, 61-2.

¹⁶³ Thus the phrase εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε would be referencing the constituent elements of the baptism ritual, which we shall delineate below.

¹⁶⁴ Gregory Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (N.Y.: Ballentine, 1978), 179-89.

¹⁶⁵ Richard Bauman, *Verbal Art as Performance* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1984), 10, 15-16.

2.3. The Relationship between πίστις and βαπτίζειν in Galatians 3:26-27

One of the more perplexing challenges to the exegete to date is the question of the precise relationship between πίστις and βαπτίζειν with regard to the Galatians' soteriological status ἐν Χριστῷ.¹⁶⁶ On the one side of the equation, the entire ecclesiastical community (cf. the emphasis on πάντες at the front of v. 26) shares a common predicate as the result of the 'coming of faith' in 3:23, namely, they are all υἱοὶ θεοῦ, a unique motif for Paul, used only in Romans (Rom 8:14; 9:26) and Galatians (3:26; cf. 4:6-7).¹⁶⁷ Read against the backdrop of v. 25, it appears as a filial status enjoyed currently by the Galatians that grounds (γάρ) the fact that they are now no longer under a παιδαγωγός. The emphasis on the 'in Christ' motif throughout the pericope suggests that the two prepositional phrases διὰ τῆς πίστεως and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ each modify the verb, such that the 'in Christ' motif stands out: 'You are all in Christ Jesus sons of God through faith'.¹⁶⁸ Thus, vv. 26 and 28 deal with who can be 'in' Christ, v. 27 deals with how one gets 'into' Christ, and v. 29 deals with who 'belongs' to Christ.¹⁶⁹ And yet, grammatically, the connecting particle γάρ grounds the πίστις in v. 26 in the εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε reference in v. 27a, with the ἄρα in v. 29 drawing out the inference from these premises.¹⁷⁰ Thus, v. 26 appears to ground their soteriological status as 'sons of God' in πίστις, while v. 27a appears to ground that status in their baptisms.

¹⁶⁶ The issue of whether πίστις Χριστοῦ represents a subjective or objective genitive (Christ being either the subject or object of faith) in Galatians will be explored in more detail with the Antiochene meals below. The *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* proposals that follow, including my own, appropriate the phrase as an objective genitive (i.e. 'faith in Christ').

¹⁶⁷ This filial context led Meeks, *First Urban*, 152 to interpret the baptism ritual in Galatians as a ritual of adoption, a view that has been subsequently developed in the work of Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 76-7, 104-6. Johnson Hodge examines the relevance of ritualisation in the forging of kinship relations in the Graeco-Roman world. She documents several examples of how rituals created, organised and maintained kinship ties and family hierarchies. However, Johnson Hodge's examples of ritual and kinship formation omit any reference to the connection between kinship and ritual *washing*, and she thus fails to scrutinise the significance of the uniqueness of Christian ritualisation.

¹⁶⁸ As opposed to, 'You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus'. So, too, Oepke, "εἰς," *TDNT* 2: 434, n.54; Dunn, *Galatians*, 202; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 150; F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), 184; Rudolph Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), 125; Fung, *Galatians*, 171-2.

¹⁶⁹ Wayne Walden, "Galatians 3:28: Grammar Observations," *ResQ* 51 no. 1 (2009): 45-50, 47.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 151.

Unfortunately, as Richard Carlson states the matter: “Paul never explicitly spells out the precise interrelationship between faith and baptism...”¹⁷¹

There are, to date, two main proposals accounting for this relationship, what we might call the *ex opere operato* proposal and the *ex opere operantis* proposal. I shall survey each in turn.

First, there is what may be called the *ex opere operato* proposal, the basic idea being that the baptism ritual accomplishes its ends irrespective of the faith of the baptised. This view is best represented by the general consensus among the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, which tended toward what Wagner terms a “mystico-physical” appropriation of baptism analogous to the ritual dynamics operative in mystery initiations.¹⁷² For example, W. Heitmüller, drawing from Gal 3:27 and Rom 6:2-4, argues that baptism works in the Catholic sense of *ex opere operato*, in that the baptismal act effects for the baptised a real union with Christ, a clothing with Christ that liberates the baptised from the powers of darkness, in a manner not conditioned by the faith of the recipient or the administrator.¹⁷³ Heitmüller, however, believed that faith in the gospel was precisely what distinguished Christian baptism from the mysteries and accounts for Paul’s genius, arguing that though the magical nature of the sacrament was part of Paul’s thinking, it was only because the world was not yet able to comprehend the spiritual (i.e. superior) nature of the gospel, which was Paul’s own modification of the baptismal tradition.¹⁷⁴ Though critical of the *Schule*, Schweitzer’s comments on Pauline baptism evidence a similar *ex opere operato* significance. In contrast to the mystery initiations, Pauline baptism for Schweitzer “is not a question of an act which the believer accomplishes in himself; what happens is that in the moment when he receives baptism, the dying and rising again of Christ takes place in him without any cooperation, or exercise of will or thought, on his part.”¹⁷⁵ Kirsopp Lake, referencing Gal 3:27 and Rom 6:3, argues that baptism effects union with Christ in such a way that it is “universally and unquestioningly accepted as a ‘mystery’ or sacrament

¹⁷¹ R.P. Carlson, “The Role of Baptism in Paul’s Thought,” *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 255-66, 262.

¹⁷² Günter Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and The Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans VI. 1-11, in the Light of Religio-Historical “Parallels,”* trans. by J.P. Smith (Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967), 14.

¹⁷³ *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus. Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 16; cf. 9-10, 14-15.

¹⁷⁴ *Taufe und Abendmahl*, 36.

¹⁷⁵ *Paul and His Interpreters*, 225-6.

which works *ex opere operato* ...”¹⁷⁶ However, Lake, like Heitmüller, sees faith as a prerequisite qualification for baptism and salvation. The reason Paul spends more time discussing faith is because faith was disputed while the ritual washing was not, the disputation probably involving the Jewish insistence that faith ought to include acceptance of Torah.¹⁷⁷

Secondly, there is what might be called the *ex opere operantis* position. The logic here is that the faith of the participants was indispensable to the efficacy of the ritual washing, based on the fact that there are times when Paul speaks of being ‘in Christ’ without any mention at all of baptism (cf. Gal 2:19ff), accompanied by passages that clearly teach that baptism does not guarantee faithfulness on the part of the baptised (cf. 1 Cor 10:1-12). Thus, Bultmann argues that Paul “by no means unconditionally attributes magic influence to baptism, as if receiving it guaranteed salvation.”¹⁷⁸ Baptism instead appropriates and confirms for the believer his or her faith in response to the proclaimed word.¹⁷⁹ Deissmann, too, argues that while passages like Gal 3:27 read apart from their context might suggest that Paul considered baptism to be that act which mediated the believer’s access to Christ, “it is more correct to say that baptism does not bring about but only sets the seal to the fellowship of Christ. In St. Paul’s own case at any rate it was not baptism that was decisive, but the appearance of Christ to him before Damascus; nor did he consider himself commissioned to baptise, but to evangelise.”¹⁸⁰ Similarly, F.M. Rendtorff argues that “die Grundvoraussetzung alles dessen, was Paulus vom Tauberlebnis sagt, ist der Glaube,” that is, “Das Tauberlebnis ist also Glaubenserlebnis.”¹⁸¹

Contemporary scholarship has overwhelmingly sided with the *ex opere operantis* position, generally seeing as incredible the idea that Paul could advocate the soteriological significance of a baptism ritual while condemning any salvific efficacy in circumcision or the ‘works of the Law’. In this vein Bruce writes: “if Paul makes baptism the gateway to ‘being-in-Christ’, is he not attaching soteriological efficacy to a rite which

¹⁷⁶ *The Earlier Epistles of St Paul: their motive and origin* (London: Rivingtons, 1911), 385.

¹⁷⁷ *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 388.

¹⁷⁸ Bultmann, *Theology*, 312.

¹⁷⁹ Bultmann, *Theology*, 312. Cf. a similar concern over the “magical” versus “sacramental”, the latter entailing a human contribution to the ritual, in Albrecht Oepke, *Der Brief De Paulus And Die Galater* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957), 89.

¹⁸⁰ *St. Paul*, 131.

¹⁸¹ F.M. Rendtorff, *Die Taufe im Urchristentum im Lichte der neueren Forschungen: ein kritischer Bericht* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905), 32, 36; so, too, Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 126.

in itself is as external or ‘material’ as circumcision? ... Paul, who had learned so clearly the religious inadequacy of the old circumcision, was not the man to ascribe *ex opere operato* efficacy to another external rite.”¹⁸² Bruce instead proposes that baptism functions more as a metonymy, that it, it is joined together with repentance, faith, the gift of the Spirit and the reception of communion to constitute the “one complex experience of Christian initiation,” such that what is true of the experience as a whole can be ascribed to any constituent element.¹⁸³ Betz is concerned that Paul’s argument culminating in the baptism allusion not be taken as a *ritus ex opere operato*, such that the ritual is sacramentally objective while faith in Christ is subjective.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, if anything, it is faith in Christ that has been predicted by Scripture and has become an objective historical reality through Christ (3:23, 25). For Betz, the role baptism plays in the letter is the ritual’s link to the gift of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12:13).¹⁸⁵ Fung interprets Paul’s baptism reference as a “sign and seal put upon the act of faith,” citing approvingly Bruce’s metonymic sense where what is true of faith is predicated of baptism.¹⁸⁶ G. Barth, along with L. Hartman, argues that while 3:26 and 3:27 are closely parallel to one another, faith and baptism are not the same, but rather represent two different modes (subjective and objective) by which divine sonship is received: “daß der Glaube das subjektive Mittel der Aneignung des Heils ist wie die Taufe das objektive Mittel der Zueignung des Heils.”¹⁸⁷

However, with their distinctive features duly noted, the *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* proposals do in fact share a common assumption: they both place πίστις and βαπτίζειν in a dichotomous relationship. By proposing that baptism operated

¹⁸² F.F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 185. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 156, echoes Bruce in commenting that if Paul were simply substituting one external rite (circumcision) for another (baptism), then he would have settled the dispute by appealing to their baptism as a necessary complement to their faith as Jews believed circumcision was. So, too, Christiansen, who concludes that for Paul circumcision is “too limited to serve as an entry rite of the vertical covenant relationship when status in relation to God is given as that of a child to parent. Instead a *different boundary mark, the Spirit is given*. But nowhere does Paul suggest that one rite, circumcision, is replaced by another rite, baptism” (E.J. Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul* [AGJU 27; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995], 290, emphasis original).

¹⁸³ Bruce, *Galatians*, 186. So, too, Anthony R. Cross, “Spirit- and Water-Baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13,” in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 141, 144,

¹⁸⁴ Betz, *Galatians*, 187.

¹⁸⁵ Betz, *Galatians*, 181-2.

¹⁸⁶ Fung, *Galatians*, 174.

¹⁸⁷ *Taufe*, 105; cf. Hartman, *Into the Name*, 62: “Faith becomes the subjective element which involves acceptance of the salvation which is preached in the message of the cross, whereas baptism becomes the objective means whereby the same salvation is conferred on a person.”

irrespective of faith on the one hand and symbolic of or supplemental to faith on the other, both proposals fail to take into account the unique state of affairs constituted by ritual performance, which in effect transforms private subjective processes into public objective acceptance. Rappaport provides an especially illuminative model that explains the logic behind this transformation.

2.3.1. The Digital Transformation of Private Processes

Rappaport observes that there is a significant degree of incommensurability between private subjective belief and the public order. The private realm consists of so-called “primary process thought,” characterised by the primacy of imagery, symbolism, analogy, metaphor, while the public realm consists of “secondary process thought,” characterised by the primacy of the political, economic, demographic, social processes.¹⁸⁸ The problem is that information does not naturally or necessarily translate from one domain to the other, which would account for the intuitive dichotomous relationship between faith and baptism as evidenced by the above studies. Thus, the question is: How can information relevant for the one translate into terms that are meaningful to the other?

For Rappaport, ritualisation is precisely that social strategy that overcomes uniquely the incommensurable metrics between private and public domains. Ritual processes do so by imposing highly definite *temporal* demarcations upon indefinite and vague psychological processes. To better understand this temporal phenomenon, we can conceive of time in terms of two distinct manifestations: analogic and digital. While analogic time is characterised by the ambiguity of the constancy of continuous infinitesimal gradations of time, such as the way we experience time at the personal and private level, digital time is characterised by discontinuous leaps of time commensurate with our experience of set definite times inherent in the public order.¹⁸⁹ Perhaps a metric illustration might help clarify the distinction. As a child grows, parents or physicians mark the process of growth, separated by a number of months and eventually years, on a chart. After several markings, the growth of the child can be experienced at highly definite, that is, *digital*, discontinuous intervals. However, neither the child nor parents were aware of her or his growth in between the marked intervals, since the growth itself

¹⁸⁸ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 99.

¹⁸⁹ Roy A. Rappaport, “The Obvious Aspects of Ritual,” in idem, *Ecology*, 184.

is *analogic*, it takes place through imperceptible continuous gradations. Both the digital and analogical are distinct manifestations of time, but the latter is imperceptible while the former is unique in its perceptibility. Rappaport notes that ritualised behaviour, rooted in the public social order, is distinctly digital in its temporal significance and thus shapes our experience of time with highly visible and pronounced definiteness. In fact, it is this digitality inherent in ritual which accounts for the non-recurrence of initiation rites, in that ritual participation removes any ambiguity with regard to one's status by rooting the transformation of that status in a highly visible and definite rite of passage.

The significance of Rappaport's ritual theory for our investigation is that the baptism ritual, as entailing a highly definite demarcation of time, would impose effectually a *publicly* recognised clarity and lucidity upon *private* subjective processes of faith and belief. Faith in Christ, in the context of ritual processes, would in turn be transformed into public confessions indicative of the objective social order to which such confessions are specific, thus indicating the individual's participation in it.¹⁹⁰ As we saw above in our understanding of the role of ritual in establishing the acceptance necessary for the efficacy of performative acts and utterances, the public profession of faith demonstrates an acceptance of the objective social order constituting the baptism ritual, since any rejection by the performers of the very messages that they are communicating through their bodies is self-contradictory and therefore impossible.¹⁹¹ Thus, performing a ritual establishes an acceptance which is indicated unambiguously both to the ritual participant and to others. Through ritualisation, private belief in effect transforms into public acceptance.

The question before us is whether our text evidences a ritualised temporality associated with baptism that would in effect objectivise 'faith in Christ' into a public illocution that established unambiguously the ritual participant's acceptance of and thus identification with a distinctly Christian social order. I shall begin my analysis with oppositions identified initially by J.L. Martyn as 'apocalyptic antinomies', and develop this analysis in terms of an ancient conception of time. I shall then turn to our text to determine the extent to which ritualised periodicity is evident in the baptism ritual. I shall argue that the relationship between πίστις and βαπτίζειν in 3:26-27 evidences a ritualised

¹⁹⁰ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 140.

¹⁹¹ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 119.

temporal mechanism that in effect sets apart πίστις as a public objective value which in turn informs the ritual washing as distinctly Christian.

2.3.2. Time and World in Antiquity

In his groundbreaking 1985 essay, “Apocalyptic Antinomies,” J.L. Martyn threw into relief the significance of eschatological time for the structure and content of Paul’s thought in Galatians.¹⁹² Martyn foregrounds the constellation of oppositions running throughout Galatians: God/ humans 1:1 (cf. 11-12); the messianic age/ the present evil age 1:4; the true gospel/ false gospel 1:6-9; life in Judaism/ life as a Christian 1:13-17; Law/ faith 2:15-4:31; Hagar/ Sarah 4:21-5:1; Spirit/ flesh 5:16-7; old world/ new creation 6:15; etc, and argues that these oppositions reflect a widespread and ancient *topos* concerning the fundamental structure or building blocks of the universe portrayed in binary terms.¹⁹³ Martyn contends that when we probe into the nature of these pairs of opposites (Paul’s abrogation of binaries and introduction of new ones), we find ourselves dealing with motifs clearly *apocalyptic*; that is, “Paul’s theology in Galatians rests upon an apocalyptic narrative about the end of the old age and the beginning of a new one,” with the cross representing the “event in which he rescues humanity from slavery.”¹⁹⁴

Since Louis Martyn’s essay, there have been a number of studies that observe eschatological patterns of thought in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians.¹⁹⁵ But as of yet none have explored these eschatological frames of reference in relation to the temporal significance of ritualised processes. To do so, we shall first survey ancient conceptions of

¹⁹² J. Louis Martyn, “Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” *NTS* 31 (1985): 410-424.

¹⁹³ Martyn, “Apocalyptic Antinomies,” 413.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002), xxxix.

¹⁹⁵ E.g. John M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: A Study in Paul’s Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988); Moisés Silva, “Eschatological Structures in Galatians,” in Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva (eds.), *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 140-162; Hall, “Arguing Like an Apocalypse”; Cosgrove, *Cross*; Hays, *The Faith*; Don Garlington, *An Exposition of Galatians: A New Perspective/Reformational Reading* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003); James M. Scott, “‘For as Many as are of Works of the Law are Under a Curse’ (Gal 3:10),” in James A. Sanders and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 187-221; N.T. Wright, “Gospel and Theology in Galatians,” in L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker* (JNSTSup108; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 222–239.

time and then compare these conceptions with the temporal dynamics in Galatians. We shall then determine whether such temporal dynamics are ritually evident in Gal 3:26-29.

As anthropological studies suggest, time in its various dimensions – historical or cosmic, public or private, linear or cyclical, continuous or discontinuous – is a fundamental feature of the life experiences of populations. The ancient conception of time is, as one might suspect, rather ambiguous. Briefly sketched, time was broadly conceived as “an uncanny alternation of opposites,” day and night, summer and winter, young and old, birth and death.¹⁹⁶ In the Greek mind, as evidenced by the beginning of the second book of Thucydides, whose attempt to find a panhellenically satisfying date for the start of the Archidamian War (431 BCE) provides a synchronism of years and events, significant historical events were not retroactively placed in this thing called ‘time’. Instead, time was constructed around significant events.¹⁹⁷ Time, as such, was generally relative to people and their deeds, with each polis, region, and village uniquely marking time in accordance with matters and men indigenous to their locality. It was Plato, in his *Timaeus*, who in effect inverts this time/ event relationship by bringing to fruition the concept of a preexistent sense of time, proportionately transforming terms such as αἰών, χρόνος and καιρός to reflect this time/ eternity relationship.¹⁹⁸ For Plato, the Father of Creation, who is eternal, ordered the cosmos in such a way as to image forth eternity, so that the transitoriness of the universe, its successions and repetitions, provides temporal and spatial analogies to eternity in relation to which historical events can be interpreted.¹⁹⁹

According to the study by Sacha Stern, the ancient Jewish conception of time is more in line with the pre-Platonic emphasis on event and chronological process, or, said differently, specific points in time rather than a time continuum.²⁰⁰ The primacy of event and process in the Jewish mind is evident in the observation that the term χρόνος and its Greek conception of an active flowing continuum is absent from the Hellenistic-

¹⁹⁶ Arno Borst, *The Ordering of Time: From the Ancient Computers to the Modern Computer* (ET by Andrew Winnard; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 5.

¹⁹⁷ Denis Feeney, *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 15, 17.

¹⁹⁸ *Tim.* 37D-39A.

¹⁹⁹ Borst, *Ordering*, 9.

²⁰⁰ Sacha Stern, *Time and Process in Ancient Judaism* (Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2007 [2003]).

influenced Wisdom of Solomon, as it is in 1 Maccabees. Instead of the expression ‘time having gone by’, which Stern notes as a familiar phrase in Greek historical writings, 1 Maccabees has ‘after these things’ (5:37; 7:33; cf. Gen 15:1; Esther 2:1). Similarly, instead of the popular ‘he spent time’, 2 Macc 11:40 has ‘he stayed there for many days’. Stern argues that such temporal-phrase replacements evidence that the Jewish mind generally had no notion of time as an entity in itself, “a dimension of reality, a flowing continuum, or a useful commodity.”²⁰¹ While authors such as Philo and Josephus freely borrowed from Greek concepts of time in their writings, the appearance of this concept can be directly traced to Greek, not Hebraic, influence.²⁰² Instead, Jewish authors, even during the Second-Temple period dominated by Graeco-Roman culture, consistently conceive of reality as a series of discrete events and processes, an event-dominated worldview, as attested by early Greek thought, by no means specific to ancient Judaism.

The Jewish emphasis on the punctiliar, the highly definite, procedural view of time is intensified significantly in Jewish apocalyptic literature. While as a literary composition, an apocalypse may be defined as that “which needs an extra revelation to authorize its content; for example, an angel reveals things which are not written in Scripture,”²⁰³ I am more interested in the significance of the term for a distinctive conception of *time*.²⁰⁴ As Moshe Barasch writes: “Whenever we refer to an apocalypse, the aspect of time is built-in.”²⁰⁵ Specifically, apocalypse/ apocalyptic involves a general understanding of the present as the final period of history in relation to which the end of time is imminent.²⁰⁶ At Qumran, the largely unspecified term ‘end of days’ (אֶחָרִית הַיָּמִים) was understood as encompassing their whole existence, both in the present (1QH^a) and in the future (cf. 1QSa II, 11-22; 4Q161 [4QpIsa^a] 8-10 17-24; 4Q174 [*Florilegium*] 1-2 I, 10-13), which was the final stage in a framework of history that would culminate in the final judgment

²⁰¹ Stern, *Time*, 102.

²⁰² Stern, *Time*, 100.

²⁰³ A. Steudel, “The Development of Essenic Eschatology,” in *Apocalyptic Time*, Albert I. Baumgarten (ed), (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2000), 79-86, 83.

²⁰⁴ John J. Collins has noted that part of the reason why ‘apocalyptic’ is an ambiguous term is that it is used in scholarly literature both as an adjective and as a noun. For the sake of clarity, Collins advocates that ‘apocalyptic’ be used solely as an adjective, as I shall use it below. See *The Apocalyptic Imagination* 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, OH, 1998), 1-19; cf. Robert R. Wilson, “The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic,” in Abbas Amanat and Magnus T. Bernhardsson (eds.), *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2002), 56-66, 57-8.

²⁰⁵ Moshe Barasch, “Apocalyptic Space,” in *Apocalyptic Time*, 305-26, 305.

²⁰⁶ Steudel, “Development,” 84, 86.

of God, vindicating the righteous and destroying all evil (cf. 1QM, the so-called ‘War Scroll’).²⁰⁷ Thus, while members of the community did not compose any apocalypses themselves, they did focus strongly on copying apocalypses (such as 1 Enoch and Daniel) and interpreting biblical texts according to temporal schemes and timetables in relation to their own age (cf. 1QpHab; 4QpPs^a).²⁰⁸

With our ritual theory and historical context in place, we shall now examine the epistolary context of 3:26-29 to determine the extent to which a comparable conception of time is ritually evident, and the relevance of such for determining the πίστις/ βαπτίζειν relationship.

2.3.3. Baptism, Faith and Time

In Gal 3:26-29, Paul situates baptism within an extended exposition of a redemptive historical narrative. In responding to the Galatians’ ‘turning away from the gospel’ (1:6-9), Paul rehearses the drama of the long-awaited messianic age, making clear that this time has now arrived through the death of Christ (2:15-21; 3:22-25; 6:12-15). The temporal significance of ritualisation is thus highly intriguing with regard to how the baptism citation fits into this historical schema.

The historical dimensions of Paul’s concern are developed in 3:6f, where the πνεῦμα/ πίστις identification in 3:2-5 is cast in terms of the historical fulfillment of the original Abrahamic promise in Christ (3:8, 14, 16), a fulfillment that incorporates eschatologically the nations into the blessings of God (1:16; 3:8, 14; cf. Rom 16:25-26).²⁰⁹ In contrast to this international fulfillment, Paul identifies those (Jews) who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου as being ὑπὸ κατάραν as promised by the Sinai covenant itself (τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου, 3:10).²¹⁰ The concomitant promise of redemption from ‘the curse of the Law’ by πίστις in

²⁰⁷ Marcus K.M. Tso argues that the term ‘end of days’ does not have a single meaning in the Scrolls, noting that the term occurs in both early and late texts, evidencing that “the sectarians ... had diverse and changing views about the End of Days...” (*Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation* [WUNT 292, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 148). One example of this diversity is the pre-Qumran CD XX 13-20 which predicted the day of judgment 40 years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness which, in the light of its failed occurrence, required the Qumranites to adjust their calculations (149).

²⁰⁸ Oded Irshai, “Dating the Eschaton: Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Calculations in Late Antiquity,” in Baumgarten, *Apocalyptic Time*, 114.

²⁰⁹ Silva, “Eschatological,” 152.

²¹⁰ See Scott, “For as Many,” for the development of Paul’s citation in 3:10 as reflecting an understanding of Deut 27-32 read as a literary unit.

Paul's citation of Hab 2:4 in 3:11 is realised in the 'coming' of Christ in 3:13-14 (cf. 3:19, 23), the coming of whom would temporally qualify the Law (ὁ νόμος ... προσετέθη ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα in 3:19).

We may thus observe the distinctly temporal significance of Paul's use of πίστις, evident in his personification of the noun in 3:23-25 to denote the 'coming' (ἔρχομαι) of the promised seed in v. 19, a coming that is explicitly 'apocalypsed' (ἀποκαλύπτω) in 3:23 (cf. 1:12, 16; 2:2).²¹¹ This faith-coming signifies a divinely-ordained rescue in 3:25 from the παιδαγωγός function of the Law in 3:24 (ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως; cf. also the parallel temporal clause ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου in 4:4 and its messianic relationship to redeeming τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον in 4:5). Thus, Paul's use of πίστις in vv. 25-26 has been interpreted as a metonymy of the gospel,²¹² or, said differently, as a "marker within the history of redemption"²¹³ in a manner equivalent to the 'coming of Christ'. In other words, as Cosgrove has observed, "'faith' [is used] by itself to designate the soteriological reality which, with and like Christ, 'comes'".²¹⁴

Cosgrove's simile between 'faith' and 'Christ' is important for our analysis. In the Galatian context, πίστις is consistently presented as a temporal reality, a sphere, as it were, that is not reducible to the private psychological processes of the individual. Particularly in its nominal personification in 3:23, 25, πίστις for Paul is an objective reality in which one participates or communes in a manner that frees one from the imprisonment of the 'present evil age' (3:23-25; cf. 1:4). Hence, by grounding their participation in this new age of the Spirit (3:1-5, 14), marked by πίστις, in the baptismal formula (γάρ, 3:27), Paul provides a highly visible unambiguous digital distinction between the 'present evil age' (constituted by mundane time; Gal 1:4) and 'new creation' (constituted by ritual time in the gathering of the *ekklesia*; 6:15), where both time and space are reconstituted. Thus, Paul is able to appeal to a *point in time* in the past (the aorist ἐβαπτίσθητε) as the foundation for their *current* status as 'sons of God' who have a new social identity (3:27). Their baptisms in the past mean in the present, 'There is

²¹¹ As per Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies," 417.

²¹² Cf. Bultmann, "πιστεύω κτλ.," in *TDNT* 6:220: "The 'coming of πίστις is the eschatological time (Gal 3:23ff).'" For a development of the biblical use of metonymy, see G.B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), 136-37.

²¹³ Scott J. Hafemann, "Paul and the Exile of Israel in Galatians 3-4," in James M. Scott (ed.), *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, (Leiden: E J Brill, 1997), 329-371, 333.

²¹⁴ *Cross*, 56; cf. 55-57.

neither Jew nor Greek ...’ ‘You *are* (ἐστε) one in Christ’ (3:28). Vocalizations such as Ἀββα ὁ πατήρ and κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Gal 4:6; Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3) indicate that they *now* know God (νῦν ... γινόντες θεόν; Gal 4:9; cf. 1 Thess 1:9), that the *time* “before faith came” when ‘we *were* kept under the Law’ (νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα, Gal 3:23) has come to an end so that ‘we *are* no longer (οὐκέτι ... ἐσμεν)’ under it (3:25), resulting in the adoption of sons and a new worldwide family of God made manifest at baptism (3:27-29).

And because the ritualised demarcation of time involves the performative body, it is most natural for Paul to explain this baptism in terms of the predicate phrase in v. 27b: Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε.²¹⁵ As we analysed above, the clothing reference here approximates the Galatians’ bodily relation to Christ as analogous to the body’s relation to its clothing. While there are a number of possibilities for what Paul might be referencing with this phrase,²¹⁶ the important point for our analysis is that the ἐνδύω motif in 3:27b suggests that it is the baptised *body* that serves as the location for Christian identity and thereby is transformed ritually into a transmitter of eschatological reality. Thus, from the vantage point of a performative act, it appears that Paul is declaring nothing less than the fact that the washing of the body involves a somatic identity with Christ akin to his clothing the

²¹⁵ The importance of the body as apocalyptic space has been noted by the general comment of Moshe Barasch, “Apocalyptic Space,” 305: “An apocalyptic event, whether past or future, takes place *somewhere*, in some surroundings or environment, however vaguely this environment may be conceived.”

²¹⁶ The multiple implications for the ‘clothing with Christ’ reference is helpfully explored by Kim, *Significance of Clothing*, 112-33. In the context of the distinctly *filial* language of divine sonship in v. 26, the παιδαγωγός reference in vv. 24-25, and the reference to overcoming a childhood status (νήπιος) in 4:1, I am inclined toward interpreting Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε as an eschatological *toga virilis*. The recent studies by Kim and J. Albert Harrill provide highly illuminating glimpses into how clothing in the Graeco-Roman world was inextricably linked to rites of passage associated with family, social status and citizenship. This ritualised use of clothing was particularly on display in the *toga virilis* ritual which transformed an adolescent male into a Roman citizen and which, in light of his allusions to παιδαγωγός (3:24-25) and νήπιος (4:1) and the subsequent ethical paraenetic in 5:13-6:10, appears to be Paul’s frame of reference for the baptism ritual in 3:27. See Kim, *Significance of Clothing*, 93-95; J. Albert Harrill, “Coming of Age and Putting on Christ: The *Toga Virilis* Ceremony, Its Paraenesis, and Paul’s Interpretation of Baptism in Galatians,” *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 251-77. Interpreting baptism as an eschatological *toga virilis*, an eschatological rite of passage into a new family, would not only be an innovative use of an idiomatic frame of reference intelligible to Graeco-Roman populations, but also link together the ἐνδύω motif of v. 27b with the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in v. 28, which most commentators interpret as a reference to LXX Gen 1:27. If ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ is in fact an allusion to the primordial Garden, then the ἐνδύω of v. 27b could indicate the reversal of the ἐνδύω involving the garments of shame in Gen 3:21. Cf. Oepke, *TDNT* 2:321-2, who notes that in the LXX, ἐνδύω is used mostly in the place of לבש, ‘the putting on of garments’ (cf. the so-called garments of shame in Gen 3:21).

baptised.²¹⁷ The bodies of the baptised are the location for Christological identity and unity, and hence the eschatological conception of time presented here by Paul is inseparable from the space of the Galatians' ritualised bodies, which, as we saw above, would be integral to the success of the original performative acts and utterances to which Paul is referring.

With this temporally reoriented body, we are now in a position to see specifically how Paul relates πίστις and βαπτίζειν in 3:26-27. We noted above in our discussion on the possibility of a baptismal formula in 3:27-28 that while Paul's usage of the construction βαπτίζειν εἰς Χριστόν is not necessarily a reference to or abridgement of the actual ritualised declaration of baptism 'into the name of Jesus', in the context of performative utterances it can be taken as Paul's confirmation that Christian baptism involves an identification or union with Christ that was in fact declared at the baptism (cf. 1 Cor 13c, 15; 6:11). Accounting for this confession of faith, 3:26-27 would then represent an interplay between two reciprocally related ritualised strategies: the temporal and digital demarcation inherent in the baptism ritual had the effect of setting the confession of Christ-faith apart from the 'present evil age' (1:4), while the confession of Christ-faith informed the temporal and digital demarcation with messianic significance, thus setting baptism apart from all other alternative ritual washings.²¹⁸ Said differently, the proclamation of faith in Christ both *set apart* the associated ritual washings as uniquely Christian (identifying the washing with the Lordship of Christ verbally proclaimed) and *was set apart by* the ritual washings (in that the ritualised washings provided a distinct embodiment of time by which the faith proclamation was set apart from all other competing allegiances characteristic of the Graeco-Roman and Jewish worlds). Thus, baptism in 3:27a grounds (γάρ) temporally πίστις in 3:26, while πίστις informs the temporality of baptism as distinctly messianic.

We therefore conclude that baptism in Galatians is presented by Paul as an apocalyptic ritual that generates performatively a spatio-temporal dualism of 'this world'

²¹⁷ For Schlier, the sacramental "Übereignung" (transfer or distribution) significance of baptism is determined by the fact that baptism 'clothes' the believer with Christ, who functions as a heavenly garment transforming the Christian into a new creation (cf. Gal 6:15). Thus, baptism is the objective basis of their Christian existence. See Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), 128-9.

²¹⁸ For alternative ritual washings in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds, see below.

and ‘the world to come’/ ‘the new creation’ located in the space of the baptised body. In clothing its participants in Christ, baptism transforms ‘faith in Christ’ into an indicator of the dawning of the messianic age and its adoptive sonship as over against the ‘present evil age’ indicated by the ‘curse of the Law’ (cf. 6:15; 1:4; 3:10). In this way, baptism in Galatians does not work *supplemental* to or irrespective of faith, nor does baptism *symbolise* faith; rather, baptism *sanctifies* faith, setting it apart from the present evil age and revealing to those who are ‘Jews by nature’ as well as ‘sinners among the Gentiles’ (2:15) that their time under the pedagogical function of the Law (3:23-25) and στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4:3, 8-9) has come to an end in the baptismal dawning of the messianic age.²¹⁹ Reciprocally, the confession of Christ-faith *informs* the temporal nature of the baptism ritual with messianic significance and thus transforms the ablution into a distinctly Christian ritual washing.

Thus, by setting baptism and faith in a dichotomous rather than in a dialectic relationship, both the *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* proposals fail to appreciate how πίστις and βαπτίζειν in Galatians are in fact *irreducible to one another*. Ritualised processes, such as baptism, transform performatively subjective states (such as πίστις) into objective acceptance by imposing highly digital and thus definite temporal demarcations upon the bodies of ritual participants. By demonstrating an acceptance of the messages communicated through Christian ritual washing, the status of the baptised in relation to the baptising community is unambiguously established. It is in this performative sense that circumcision generated a world made of Jews and Gentiles, those with and those without the Law (cf. 2:15).²²⁰ Baptism, on the other hand, reveals a world of new creation and old creation, those with and without faith in Christ (cf. 2:16).²²¹

²¹⁹ Scott observes that the 430 years which Israel spent in Egyptian bondage (Ex 12:40; cf Gen 15:13) is behind Paul’s thinking in Gal 4:1-7, particularly as it relates to Ezek 20:33-38 (cf. Dan 9:15-19; 1QM 1:2-3) which “views the deliverance from exile as a ‘redemption’ of Israel from bondage and as a new exodus” (“For as Many,” 208).

²²⁰ John Barclay observes that one of the most important social functions of circumcision was identifying with whom female Jews may have sexual intercourse, limiting their marriage options and discouraging exogamy. Barclay comments: “Thus ... circumcision was not an isolated cultural trait but was closely integrated with other strands of Jewish identity, including the fundamental ethnic bond” (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996], 439, 411-12).

²²¹ Philip Esler makes the observation, from the vantage point of social identity theory, that before the arrival of Paul there were two groups, Jews and Greeks, with one boundary between them; now, however, there are in fact three groups with three boundaries: Israelite and Gentile Christ followers who are distinct from both Jews and Greeks. See Philip Francis Esler, *Galatians* (London: Routledge, 1998), 89-90.

Baptism therefore generates nothing less than the ritualised fount, the *fons et origo*, of Martyn's observed apocalyptic antinomies.²²² The constellation of oppositions running throughout Galatians (God/ humans 1:1, 11-12; the messianic age/ the present evil age 1:4; etc) are forged and shaped in and through the hierarchical relationships intrinsic to the baptism ritual. So the charge that Paul appears to be merely replacing one external ritual (circumcision) with another (baptism) is off base. Galatians is not about replacing one ritual with another, *but rather one ritually-revealed world with another*, no less than the dawning of the messianic age itself. Hence, Paul can relate the abrogation of the circumcision/ uncircumcision hierarchy to the dawning of a new creation (5:6; 6:15; cf. 2:15-16).

In summary, as an apocalyptic ritual that reveals the dawning of the messianic age, baptism reveals the *time* of faith, which in turns sets *faith* in Christ apart from the old order/ old creation and aligns it with the baptismally-revealed new creation. Reciprocally, the proclamation of Christ-faith at the ritual washing informs baptism with a meaning set apart from all other ritual washings. The temporal dimension inherent in the ritual washing combined with a confession of Christ's Lordship over the baptised to produce a distinct ritual that recalibrated temporally and spatially the baptised body. Thus, those who have been baptised into Christ no longer belong to the old order of the 'present evil age' (1:4); their faith has made them 'sons and heirs' (3:26, 29), inheritors of a new world (6:15).

2.4. The Performative Significance of Baptism: The Body and Social Order

We are now in a position to address the precise nature of the abrogated binaries in 3:28a and how they fit into Paul's argument. With our above analysis of the potential presence of a baptismal tradition, we noted that there is an inextricable relationship between embodied performatives and the establishment of social norms. This relationship is forged by the *acceptance* the ritual participant demonstrates by virtue of her or his participation in the ritual and the obligations such acceptance entails. We further noted that the temporal and Christ-faith constituents in the baptism ritual forged a temporally recalibrated body, one that communicated the dawning of the messianic age. Our next

²²² Though not recognising the temporal significance of ritualisation, Martyn, *Galatians*, 382 n.264 does refer to the baptism reference in Galatians as an "apocalyptic baptismal formula."

step is to investigate the relationship between this temporally recalibrated body and the unique social order envisioned by Paul in 3:28. Practice and performance theorists have observed an important connection between the arrangement of time and space and shared social practices in the mediating role of the body.²²³ It is this somatic mediation that I believe sheds fresh light on the relationship between baptism and the unique social conditions evident in 3:28a.

Gal 3:28a is a notoriously difficult verse for the exegete. First, it is structurally unique. The passage is structured by the threefold use of the phrase οὐκ ἔνι prior to each binary. Paul's threefold use of the verb ἔνι is derivative of the compound ἔνεμι rather than the far more common εἰμί, and is found in only four other NT passages (Luke 11:41; 1 Cor 6:5; Col 3:11; Jas 1:17).²²⁴ Like all other εἰμί-compounds, ἔνεμι has a distinct meaning, in this case, "to be or exist in a certain context."²²⁵ Thus Walden favors translating οὐκ ἔνι 'there is not here' or 'there is no longer' or 'it doesn't matter if you are'.²²⁶ Secondly, the binaries are inconsistently represented in the parallel passages of 1 Cor 12:13 and Col 3:11. For example, while the binary 'slave/ free' is paralleled in 1 Cor 12:13 and loosely so in Col 3:11, the third binary, 'male and female', appears in neither. And, thirdly, the precise rationale within Paul's argument for the pairs of antitheses slave/ free, male/ female remains elusive.²²⁷ Together with the Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσαθε reference, v. 28 has been the subject of proposals ranging from a vision of a primordial androgyne before the separation of Woman from Man,²²⁸ to a Pauline vision for the end of slavery,²²⁹

²²³ See, e.g., Theodore R. Schatzki, "Subject, Body, Place," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol 91, no. 4 (Dec 2001): 698-702; idem, *Social Practices*, *passim*.

²²⁴ Walden "Galatians," 46.

²²⁵ BDAG, 1029. Contra Bruce, *Galatians*, 187, who sees ἔνεμι as an emphatic synonym of εἰμί.

²²⁶ Walden, "Galatians," 48-9. Campbell translates the οὐκ ἔνι as a shortened form of οὐκ ἔνεστι and opts for the more emphatic: "it is not possible to be." See Campbell, "Logic of Eschatology," 61.

²²⁷ See the survey of the various exegetical proposals for this verse in Pauline Nigh Hogan, "*No Longer Male and Female*": *Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*; MacDonald, *No Male and Female*, 1-14.

²²⁸ Meeks, "Image," *passim*; Betz, *Galatians*, 197-200; MacDonald, *No Male and Female*, 113-26.

²²⁹ Richard A. Horsely, "Paul and Slavery: A Critical Alternative to Recent Readings," *Semeia* 83-84 (1998): 153-200.

to a vision of social egalitarianism between men and women,²³⁰ to a Platonic vision of a grand universal humanity,²³¹ and all from one verse!

However, what has thus far been overlooked in the above proposals is the logic that exists between the ritualised body and the formation of social order. As we noted above, Rappaport understands ritualised acceptance as the foundation for the performative establishment of social convention. For Rappaport, the ritualised body serves as the mediating location for social networks by facilitating communication in two directions, what he terms ‘allo-communication’ and ‘auto-communication’.²³² Participating in a ritual sends concurrently a message to one’s co-participants that the one performing the ritual shares with the others a common identity specific to the ritualised community, and sends a second message to oneself confirming one’s experiential state in relation to the ritualised group. What is important for our analysis is the location where both the public and private messages meet: allo-communication and auto-communication are fused together through the mechanisms of *embodiment*. The body functions as a transmitter toward others through ritualised gesticulations, verbal utterances, etc. and also toward the self, since nothing can be experienced more immediately than the sensations of one’s own body.²³³ By acting and uttering the constituent elements of a ritual, the mythical and cognised structures encoded in the ritual become indistinguishable from the performer, and because a performer cannot reject the ritual world at the same time as s/he performs it, the participant demonstrates publicly an acceptance of the messages encoded in the ritual performance.²³⁴ This acceptance inherent in the ritualised body in turn entails the obligation to live in a manner consistent with the cognised environment encoded in the ritual order, and since the failure to meet one’s obligations is universally stigmatised as immoral, the performance of ritual establishes unambiguously the participant’s ethical identity in relation to the ritualised community. Given his assertion that ritualisation alone satisfies this criterion, the establishment of social acceptance and obligation in

²³⁰ K. Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966); Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1995).

²³¹ Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

²³² *Ritual*, 51.

²³³ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 149.

²³⁴ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 119.

relation to which quotidian life and ethics are judged, Rappaport makes the bold claim that ritual is humanity's basic social act.²³⁵

2.4.1. The Performative Uniqueness of Baptised Social Orders

With our ritual theory in place, we turn now to the relationship between ritualised body and society in 3:27b and 3:28a. I have thus far argued that baptism for Paul is an apocalyptic ritual; it reveals performatively, that is digitally and definitely, through the spatio-temporal location of the believer's body the dawning of the messianic age. The key here is *reveals performatively*, that is, baptism entails what it reveals; it generates what it communicates through the very act of communication. Noting the connection between the ritualised body and community formation, we shall disambiguate precisely what kind of body was produced performatively in the baptism ritual and determine the extent to which such a body contributed to a distinctly Christian social order as envisioned by Paul in 3:28a.

In determining the kind of ritualised body that was produced in Christian ritual washings, there are a number of key identifying characteristics specific to Christian baptisms as evidenced by Paul's references:

First, there is a terminological uniqueness to the Christian washing. By the time of Paul's writings, it appears that the verb βαπτίζω (Rom 6:3; 1 Cor 1:13-17; 10:2; 12:13; 15:29; Gal 3:27) and the noun βάπτισμα (cf. Rom 6:4) became technical terms for, that is a nomenclature specific to, the ritual of Christian initiation (cf. 1 Cor 1:13-17; Rom 6:3-4; Acts 2:38; etc). What has caught the eye of scholars, however, is the uniqueness of this vocabulary in relation to Jewish and Graeco-Roman washings.²³⁶ Within the semantic field of ritual washings in the classical and Hellenistic periods, we find λούειν and λουτρόν along with general terms like ἀγνίζειν, καθαίρειν, and the compound ἀπολούειν, but βαπτίζειν is nowhere to be found.²³⁷ The verb βαπτίζειν, like its cognate βάπτειν, has the connotation of 'to dip' or 'to plunge' but unlike its cognate is used to connote a death or perishing or being overwhelmed, such as Plato's description of a boy who loses an

²³⁵ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 138.

²³⁶ J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology: Its Origins and Early Development* (Nojmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V., 1962); Oepke, "βάπτω, βαπτίζω," *TDNT* 1.529-46.

²³⁷ Ysebaert, *Greek*, 18-19.

argument (ἐγὼ γνούς βαπτίζομενον τὸ μείρακιον) in *Euthyphr.* 277d and people “soaked” or “drenched” in wine (καὶ γὰρ αὐτός εἰμι τῶν χθὲς βεβαπτισμένων) in *Symp.* 176b (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 10.169).²³⁸ Josephus used βαπτίζειν to characterise the sinking of a ship (*B.J.* 2.556; 3.368, 423, 525, 527; *Ant.* 9.212; *Vita* 15), a drowning (*B.J.* 1.437; *Ant.* 15:55), dipping something in water (*Ant.* 4.81), the Roman ‘destruction’ or ‘overwhelming’ of Jerusalem (*B.J.* 4.137), the act of plunging a sword into a throat (*B.J.* 2.476), and, echoing Plato, Gadalias’s “sinking” into unconsciousness and drunken sleep (*Ant.* 10.169).²³⁹

The ritual significance of the terms βαπτίζω and βάπτισμα appears to begin with Jewish vocabulary, and rarely at that. The verb βαπτίζειν is found in only four places in the LXX: 4 Reg 5:14 (cf. 5:10), Jdt 12:7, Sir 34:25, and Isa 21:4. Of the four references, only three deal with a literal washing. 4 Reg 5:14 translates לַבִּט into the intensive middle voice, ἐβαπτίσατο, denoting a complete washing of the body.²⁴⁰ In like manner, Jesus Sirach uses the term βαπτίζειν to denote a bath one takes after contact with a corpse in Sir 34:25, which uses the verb βαπτίζειν alongside the more frequent λουτρόν. Judith washes herself before prayer, but it is difficult to determine whether this is a specific type of ritual washing (Jdt 12:7). The NT uses the noun βαπτισμός in an analogous manner, as in Mk 7:4 and Heb 9:10 (cf. the perplexing βαπτισμοί in Heb 6:2), indicating a complete washing or cleansing of vessels or the human body, which appears to be unique to Jewish usage.²⁴¹ Other than these references, and Josephus’ sole reference to John τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου βαπτιστοῦ outside the NT (cf. βαπτισμῶ and βάπτισιν in *Ant* 18:117), βαπτίζειν is basically absent in Jewish ritual vocabulary, though the Stoic philosopher Epictetus uses the term βαπτίζειν to denote Jewish (proselyte?) washings (*Diatr.* 2.9.20). Thus, the ritualised use of βαπτίζειν and its cognates, particularly their relationship to the washed body, is highly specific to the rise of early Christian terminology.

Secondly, Pauline baptism involved at least two people, a baptiser and baptised. In 1 Cor 1:14, 16, Paul makes explicit that he was in fact the baptiser of Crispus, Gaius and

²³⁸ Ysebaert, *Greek*, 13; cf. Howard Marshall, “The Meaning of the Verb ‘Baptize’,” in Porter and Cross (eds.), *Dimensions of Baptism*, 13.

²³⁹ James Dunn, “‘Baptized’ as Metaphor,” in *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White*, ed. by Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSS 171 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 294-310, 302.

²⁴⁰ Ysebaert, *Greek*, 27.

²⁴¹ See Ysebaert, *Greek*, 14, 28-9.

the household of Stephanas, and the verb βαπτίζω is almost always in the passive tense.²⁴² Besides the baptism of John,²⁴³ there is no parallel for someone acting as an immerser alongside the bather in Jewish and Graeco-Roman washings.²⁴⁴

Thirdly, as we saw above, the baptiser initiated members into early Christian communities through the invocation of Jesus' name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, e.g. Acts 2:38; εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Acts 8:16; ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Acts 10:48).²⁴⁵ While the precise meaning of the phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ and its variants is disputed,²⁴⁶ the paradigmatic Lordship of Christ over the initiate is not.

²⁴² This includes Paul's use of the middle ἀπελούσασθε in 1 Cor 6:11, which most scholars interpret as a passive. See the discussion below.

²⁴³ John's baptism is almost universally acknowledged as the precursor to Christian baptism. See Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of Christian Baptism," in Maxwell E. Johnson (ed.), *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 35-57. For a development of the relationship between John's baptism and early Christian baptism, see our analysis of 1 Cor 12:13 below.

²⁴⁴ Joan Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 50; John Dominic Crossan, Jonathan L. Reed, *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Texts* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 2001), 155. There is very little information on the actual mode or posture of washing in the Hebrew Bible or Second Temple literature. The method of 'sprinkling' is limited to two contexts in the Hebrew Bible: it is used in the cleansing of Levites prior to service (Num 8:7) and in the red heifer rite when water is sprinkled on a person who was defiled by contact with a corpse (Num 19:18). The mode of washing parts of the body is limited exclusively to priestly activities related to their cultic duties (Exod 30:18-21). At Qumran, there are references to washing the entire body, as in 11Q19 XLV 16, where the *zav* is commanded to 'bathe his entire body in running water', that is, in 'living water'. In the Rabbinic tradition, *m. Ber.* 3:5 considers the pouring of water over the head of an individual who has had a seminal emission as equivalent to the immersion required for that particular purification (Lev 15:16; cf. Taylor, *John the Immerser*, 53). The form of ritual ablutions in the diasporic period appears variegated, consisting of sprinkling, splashing, or hand-washing (*Ep. Arist.* 304-6; *Sib Or* 3:591-93; *Philo Spec* 3:205-6), and some biblical prescriptions were modified, such as the substituting of bathing for sprinkling in the case of contact with a corpse (Sir 34:25 [31:25]; Tob. 2:5; Josephus *Apion* 2.198; cf. Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptist and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* JSNTSup 62 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991], 110 n.552). In terms of bathing posture, the closest we have to a description is 4Q512 10-11 2-4 which evidences kneeling and covering up nakedness in the context of washing.

²⁴⁵ Cf. Hurtado, *Origins*, 81-82.

²⁴⁶ The meaning of baptism 'in the name of', along with its prepositional variants (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι; εἰς τὸ ὄνομα; ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) has perplexed scholars. Hartman helpfully summarises the three proposals to date for the backdrop to the unusual phrase. First, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα was a banking term referring to a sum of money deposited into an account (W. Heitmüller). Second, the phrase is likened to the Mishnah passage (*m. Zebah.* 4.6) which exemplifies that a sacrifice was offered "into the name of the Name" (P. Billerbeck). Third, there is Hartman's proposal, in which the phrase originated in the Palestinian Church and was then translated literally into the Greek. The analogous phrases in Hebrew and Aramaic, when applied to baptism 'into the name of Jesus', designate that Jesus would be understood "as the fundamental reference of the rite." See Lars Harman, "Baptism," in David N. Freeman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1.583-94, 586. Heitmüller's influential banking metaphor has come under severe critique, given the semantic discrepancy between banking language and messianic salvation (cf. Barth, *Taufe*, 50-9; Hartman, *Into the Name*, 39-40; Fung, *Galatians*, 172). This would leave options 2 and 3 as the more plausible explanations of the term. See Hartman, *Into the Name*, 37-50.

The pronouncement of Jesus' name in baptism must have had ritual potency, in that it functioned as "a ritual means of bringing to bear upon the baptised the power of the exalted Jesus (e.g., 1 Cor 1:12; 3:23; Gal 3:29)."²⁴⁷

For our analysis, the significance of baptism 'in the name of the Lord Jesus' centers on how the pronouncement has the ritualised effect of informing ablutions as distinctly *Christian* as over against all other alternative ritual washings in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds.²⁴⁸ In the Jewish literature, the closest parallel would be the washings at Qumran. 4Q414 2-3 II 3-5 instructs that when one enters the water he shall say in response, "Blessed are Y[ou ...] for from what comes out of your mouth [...] men of impurity [...]."²⁴⁹ Along with similarly recited water blessings in 4Q284 2 II 1-6 and 4Q414 13 1-10, these are the only Jewish blessings connected with water washings outside the NT texts. Thus, the explicit combination of a ritualised washing with the invocation of a name is unique among Christian washing.

Fourthly, a fairly certain characteristic of Pauline washings is their non-recurrence. Paul never mentions anything like recurrent baptisms, and his consistent use of the aorist tense of βαπτίζειν suggests a single past action (Gal 3:27a, cf. the parallel aorist ἐνεδύσασθε in 27b; 1 Cor 1:13, 14, 15, 16 [2x]; Rom 6:3 [2x], cf. the parallel aorist συνετάφημεν in Rom 6:4). This non-recurrence is in contrast to the repetitive nature of Jewish and Graeco-Roman ritual washings.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁷ Hurtado, *Origins*, 82. Eckstein, *Verheißung*, 221-2, who interprets baptism 'in the name of Christ' as an expression of ownership, as per 3:29 'if you are Christ's' (cf. Deut 28:10; 2 Chron 7:14; Am 9:12).

²⁴⁸ Hurtado, *Origins*, 82 comments: "This ritual invocation of Jesus' name over the baptised has no parallel in other Jewish proselyte practice or in the entrance rites of groups such as the Qumran sect, and it is surely another strong indication of the re-shaping of monotheistic cultic practice that was characteristic of early Christian circles."

²⁴⁹ Jonathan D. Lawrence, *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 145.

²⁵⁰ The one reference to the possibility of multiple Christian baptisms is βαπτισμοί in Heb 6:2. As for examples of recurrent ablutions in Judaism, Josephus narrates the bathing practices of an individual named Bannus, a desert ascetic whom Josephus followed for three years prior to becoming a Pharisee, along with the practices indicative of the Essene communities (*Vita* 11-12; *Ant.* 18.18-22; *B.J.* 2.119-61). Philo thought it important to wash the body by splashing or sprinkling prior to entering the Temple (*Spec.* 3.89, 205, 6; cf. 1.261), before a sacrifice (*Spec.* 1.256-66), after sex (*Spec.* 3.63), and after contact with a corpse (*Spec.* 3.205-6). See Lawrence, *Washing in Water*, 73-4; Joan E. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-century Alexandria: Philo's 'Therapeutae' Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 141; Susan Haber, "They Shall Purify Themselves": *Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*, ed. by Adele Reinhartz (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008). On ritual washing practices at Qumran, see our analysis of 1 Cor 12:13 below. As for Graeco-Roman ritual washings, entrance into any sacred space generally required a washing purification. This requirement involved a class of facilities at the entrance of sacred precincts made up of basins of lustral water called 'sprinkling basins' (περιρραντήρια). According to

Finally, Meeks is to be credited with observing a unique feature of Christian baptism against the backdrop of lustrations in Judaism and the mysteries. Meeks notes that, in contrast to other ritual washings, Christians were not washed as preparation for initiation, but rather the washing *was* initiation. “By making the cleansing rite alone bear the whole function of initiation, and by making initiation the decisive point of entry into an exclusive community, the Christian groups created something new. For them the bath becomes a permanent threshold between the ‘clean’ group and the ‘dirty’ world, between those who have been initiated and everyone who has not.”²⁵¹ The ritual bath as that by which the community is “washed” and “sanctified,” set apart, from the outside world, by definition forges a “clean/ unclean” social binary, which for Meeks establishes a distinct Christian ethical identity, in that “clean” became a metaphor for “behaving properly.”²⁵²

Thus Christian baptisms were unique terminologically and performatively among the extant washings in the first-century Mediterranean world. I believe this ritual uniqueness was formative in the communication of a distinctly temporal body and the messianic community which inhabits that time in two interrelated ways:

Hippocrates, those wishing to enter were first required to sprinkle themselves with water from one of these containers (*Morb. sacr.* 2). A statement in the *Onomasticon* of Pollux (1:8) explains the rationale for the washing facilities: “The area inside the περιπανήτῃα is possessed by the gods, sacred, consecrated, and inviolable while that outside is open to ordinary use” (cited by Robert A. Wild, *Water in the Cultic Worship of Isis and Sarapis* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 130ff, 250-1; cf. Lucian, *Sacr.* 13; Heraclitus, *All.* 3; Iamblichus, *V. Pythag.* 18.83). Ritual washings were further shaped by the initiations associated with the mystery cults, which generally involved a Platonic-like ascent into greater degrees of knowledge, dignity and status within the cult. The most substantial extant account of initiation into a mystery comes from Apuleius in his *Metamorphoses* Book 11, where there are three different purificatory washings. On the nature of initiation and the mysteries, see Walter Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*; Roger Beck, *The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Wild, *Water*, *passim*; Thomas M. Finn, *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press), 1997, 68-89; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, *passim*; Chester, *Conversion*, 267-74, 303-16.

²⁵¹ *First Urban*, 153.

²⁵² *First Urban*, 154. The question as to whether proselyte baptism was practiced in the first-century CE and to what extent remains open. The earliest allusions to the practice are in *Sib. Or.* 4.165 and Epictetus *Diatr.* 2.9.20 but are too vague for certainty. It is generally agreed that the origin of an immersion bath for proselytes is to be found in the washings for ceremonial cleansing prescribed in the Hebrew Bible. If this were the case, then proselyte baptism would be related superficially to a ritual washing revealing the dawning of the messianic age. As such, Paul’s understanding of baptism is comparable to the penitential and prophetic imagery of water purification associated with John’s baptism, metaphorically illustrating God’s promise to effect atonement (cf. Ps 51:7-9; Ezek 36:16-22). See the discussions in Yarbrow Collins, “Origin,” 42-4; Shaye J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 219, 223; Asano, *Community-Identity*, 182-4; Everett Ferguson, *The Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 547-50.; T.F. Torrance, “Proselyte Baptism,” *NTS* 1, no. 2 (November 1954): 150-54; G. Vermes, “Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources,” *NTS* 4 (1958): 308-19; Oepke, *TDNT*, 1.535-36; Hartman ‘Baptism’ *ABD*, 585; Webb, *John the Baptiser*, 122-30.

First, if baptism is for Paul an apocalyptic ritual that reveals performatively through the spatio-temporal location of the believer's body the dawning of the messianic age, and if performatives entail what they reveal, generating what they communicate through the very act of communication, and if 3:26-29 references a ritual washing that is simply without precedent in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds, *then Christian baptism did nothing less than reveal ritually another world*. The Galatians' social and ethical identity cannot be found in any other washing, be it ritual, recreational, or medicinal, but only in that non-recurrent washing that is 'in Christ' which, by virtue of its revelatory recreation of time and space in the bodies of the Galatians, reveals all alternative rituals found in this 'present evil age', including circumcision, inadequate to account for their new identity in Christ. Thus, the Galatians' experience of Christian baptism was itself apocalyptic, in that baptism *performed* its revelatory function temporally and spatially to bear witness to the world that a new world – a world constituted by the messianic gift of the Spirit, faith, and a new worldwide people of God – has in fact dawned within their midst.

Secondly, the uniqueness of this ritually revealed world accounts for the uniqueness of the social arrangements in 3:28a. The faith that identifies Paul and Cephas as Jewish Christians in 2:16 ('We believed in Christ Jesus') and now identifies the Galatians as Christians in 3:1-5 was itself substantiated in the fact that both Jews and Gentiles, slave and free, 'males and females', were incorporated into the *ekklesia* in the same way, through a sacred washing at the hands of another (note the aorist passive, ἐβαπτίσθητε). Unlike the patriarchal nature of the circumcision rite in Judaism (cf. the emasculation reference in 5:12), the baptism rite is blind to gender, ethnicity and status, and is thus constituted by an action or series of actions that can transform states of social binaries into one of reconciliation and unity.²⁵³ In this sense, Gentiles *as Gentiles*, slaves *as slaves* and women *as women* become ritual media: their shared rite is a tangible manifestation of the dissolution of the social binaries of the dominant culture. Gal 3:28 evidences that Paul

²⁵³ Troy W. Martin argues that the backdrop to Paul's thinking in this verse is the covenant of circumcision in Gen 17:9-14, which established communal distinctions that circumscribed Jews from Gentiles (= Greeks, cf. Rom 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9; etc.), included slaves, and was specific to males, the very set of oppositions Paul announces to be abolished in Gal 3:28. Thus, Paul's inclusion of 'male and female' would underscore the irrelevance of this antithesis for baptism into the Christian community. See Troy W. Martin, "The Covenant of Circumcision (Genesis 17:9-14) and the Situational Antitheses in Galatians 3:28," *JBL* 122 No. 1 (Spring 2003): 111-25, 124.

expects the sharing of baptism to result in a radical reorientation toward one other ('sons', v. 26, 'heirs', v. 29), as such reorientation is itself recalibrated around Christ (cf. εἰς Χριστόν).²⁵⁴ Thus, the temporal re-appropriation revealed in the ritual washing involves spatial ('clothed with Christ') and social ('all one in Christ') rearrangements.²⁵⁵ As the baptised body is now oriented toward Christ, so those who share in the baptism ritual are reoriented toward one another. The rearrangement of space is inextricably linked with the rearrangement of social practices as both the spatial and social reorientations are mediated through the ritualised body.

Thus, the uniqueness of baptism forges a temporally recalibrated body which in turn mediates a comparably recalibrated social order: by experiencing the uniqueness of the Christian washing, the Galatians' own bodies testify to the fact that an age not of this present aeon has in fact dawned. Having participated in a ritual the rationale for which cannot be found in this world, they belong to a ritually revealed social arrangement that transcends the world's national, social and sexual arrangements.²⁵⁶ For the Gentile Galatians to begin living as Jews would in fact render their own particular confirming disclosure of the messianic age obsolete *and therefore compromise the apocalyptic significance of baptism!* Said differently, by relegating baptism as a sub-rite to circumcision, the Galatians would in effect assimilate baptism within a world-order

²⁵⁴ This Christocentric recalibration is why the 'primal androgyny' proposal of Meeks and the Platonic Unity proposal of Boyarin are unsuccessful, in that, as Douglas Campbell has observed, the oneness shared by the Galatians is a "oneness of sonship" (υἱοί, 3:26) as the Galatians participate in the sonship of Christ. See Campbell, "The Logic of Eschatology," 63-4. For a development of the relationship between the Galatians as 'sons of God' (υἱοὶ θεοῦ) and Christ's sonship, see James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus* (WUNT 2.48, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992).

²⁵⁵ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 151, has noticed that each Christological reference in 3:26-29 is positional or spatial, that is, each Christ reference is preceded by a preposition, 'in Christ' (ἐν Χριστῷ, vv. 26, 28), 'baptised into Christ' (εἰς Χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε, v. 27a), 'clothed with Christ' (Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε, v. 27b) and '[being] of Christ' (ὁμοῦς Χριστοῦ, v. 29). Campbell, "Logic of Eschatology," 62-3, sees the "'whole body' metaphors of immersion and re-clothing" as employing "the metaphor of spatial movement to suggest something: the baptisands have moved, as into water, into Christ, and have also been clothed in Christ," which denotes "a total or comprehensive change because it grounds the negation of the cosmic categories that follows immediately."

²⁵⁶ Attitudes toward women in antiquity generally involved a conception of male superiority, perhaps most famously illustrated by Diogenes Laertius' thanksgiving, which he attributes, citing Hermippus' *Lives*, as originating with Thales and Socrates: πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἐγενόμην καὶ οὐ θηρίον, εἶτα ὅτι ἀνὴρ καὶ οὐ γυνή, τρίτον ὅτι Ἕλλην καὶ οὐ βάρβαρος (*Vit. Phil.* 1.33; cf. the attribution of this saying to Plato in Plutarch's *Marius* 46.1 and in Lactantius, *Inst.* 3.19.17). This thanksgiving is very similar to that of the Jewish prayer from the *t. Ber.* 6.18, that encourages men to praise God for having been born not 'a gentile', 'a boor', and 'a woman' (cf. *m. Ber.* 3:3; 7:2). Josephus, *Apion*, 2:201, writes: "the woman, says the Law, is in all things inferior to the man."

revealed through *Jewish* rituals and in effect nullify baptism's apocalyptic significance. Thus, if the Galatians were to go ahead with circumcision, *they would in fact be cut-off from Christ* (5:4). They would sever themselves from a world distinctly revealed in the peculiarities of Christian baptism. As recipients of an apocalyptic ritual, their behaviour, their shared lifeworld, *must therefore be concomitantly apocalyptic!* The baptism reference and shared lifeworld in 3:27-28 thus anticipate the ethical paraenetic in 5:13-6:10 and Paul's stress on the practical reliance on the eschatological Spirit. In contrast to life in the Spirit, to seek circumcision would be to live in a manner indicative of pre-messianic time which in turn would destroy the apocalyptic significance of baptism and thus re-appropriate their bodies as mediators of distinctly Jewish space (cf. 6:12-13).²⁵⁷ Their actions would in effect return the world to its pre-messianic state and the national, social and sexual binaries entailed therein (cf. 2:11-21; 3:28 with 1:4, 6-9; 6:12-15).

2.5. Conclusion: Ritual Washing in Galatians

In our analysis of Gal 3:26-29, we addressed three major interpretive controversies, identified the questions and gaps, and then introduced relevant ritual theory which served to offer explanatory resolutions to these controversies in such a way that interrelated each one of the scholarly issues at hand.

First, we examined the text to determine the extent to which a Pauline or pre-Pauline baptismal tradition was evident. While finding the evidence for a tradition-formula wanting, the performative indicators in the text did suggest that Paul was in fact appealing to the performance of ritual washings as a mechanism for what Bateson called 'framing': by appealing to the performative indicators constitutive of the baptism ritual, Paul brought to bear upon his argument embodied, ethical and social frames of reference specific to ritualised activity.

This performative significance of 3:27-28 was then developed in our exploration of the second interpretive controversy, one that involved the relationship between πίστις and βαπτίζειν with regard to the Galatians' soteriological status ἐν Χριστῷ. We found that the two trajectories of proposals, which we termed *ex opere operato* interpretations and *ex opere operantis* interpretations, both assumed a faith/ baptism dichotomy that found little

²⁵⁷ The potential re-appropriation of the body as a mediator of Jewish space will be developed below in the context of the Antiochene meals.

support from ritual theory. Instead, we noted Rappaport's argument that rituals involve a high degree of unambiguous periodicity that effectually transforms vague and ambiguous private subjectivities into highly public indicators of acceptance. We then examined our text to determine the extent to which such ritually revealed temporal and public indicators were present, and found that Paul's emphasis on temporal distinctions (what Martyn called 'apocalyptic antinomies') involved a reciprocity between πίστις and βαπτίζειν comparable to the reciprocity between time and acceptance in Rappaport's ritual theory. By providing a highly visible unambiguous digital distinction between the 'present evil age' (constituted by mundane time; Gal 1:4) and 'new creation' (constituted by ritual time in the gathering of the *ekklesia*; 6:15), baptism transformed πίστις (i.e. the confession of Christ's Lordship over the baptised) into an eschatological indicator, which in effect set apart πίστις from all other confessions of loyalty in the 'present evil age'. Reciprocally, the confession of Christ-faith informed and endowed baptism with a distinctly messianic significance as over against all alternative ritual washings. Thus, baptism did not symbolise or supplement faith, but rather *sanctified* faith, setting it apart from the present evil age, thereby bestowing upon faith a privileged position in relation to a world constituted by Jews and Gentiles, circumcised and uncircumcised, held captive by the Law and the 'elements of this world'. The temporal dimension inherent in the ritual washing combined with a confession of Christ-faith to produce a distinctively messianic ritual. We thus concluded that baptism was an apocalyptic ritual that revealed the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the baptised.

Thirdly, we examined the controversy over the precise nature of the abrogated binaries in 3:28a and how they fit into the logic of Paul's argument. We noticed that the various proposals had not recognised the logic that exists between the ritualised body and the formation of social order. Drawing from Rappaport's observation that performatives generate acceptance by facilitating communication in two directions, 'allo-communication' and 'auto-communication', we noted a two-fold relationship between the ritualised body and the social order. First, by denoting their participation in a ritual washing without precedent in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds, Paul can appeal to the fact that the Galatians' own bodies bear witness to the revelation of another world, a messianic age that has dawned in the midst of the present evil age. Secondly, as the

baptised body is now oriented toward Christ, so those who share in the baptism ritual are reoriented toward one another. As such, the baptism ritual by virtue of its revelatory nature must transform the shared lifeworld of those who have been washed from one constituting ethnic, social and gender relationships indicative of the 'present evil age' to entirely new relationships indicative of 'new creation'. Their apocalyptic baptisms therefore entailed the obligation to live a concomitantly apocalyptic life. If the baptised Galatians followed through with their pursuit of circumcision, they would in effect be assimilating their distinctly messianic ritual washing to a world mediated by the Jewish ritualised body and thus compromise the apocalyptic significance of baptism. The Galatians therefore risked being cut-off from Christ in seeking to live out pre-messianic social conditions constituted by circumcision/ un-circumcision binaries. The performative significance of baptism thus provided temporal, somatic and social frames of reference to which Paul could appeal in order to draw the Galatians into a shared life without equivalence in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds.

A Tale of Two Baptisms: 1 Corinthians 1:10-17

3.1. Introduction

By invoking ‘the name of the Lord Jesus Christ’ in his call to unity at Corinth in 1:10, Paul recalls the power inherent in his apostolicity that was granted to him by Christ according to the will of God in v. 1, a power which has in turn transformed the Corinthians into ἀδελφοί (1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; etc) constituting ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (1:2).²⁵⁸ Having been ‘called into fellowship with God the Father and his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord’ (1:9), this community of siblings shares a common sanctification (ἡγιασμένοις) in Christ Jesus, as saints by calling (κλητοῖς ἁγίοις) (1:2; cf. 1:26), enriched in all speech and knowledge by the grace of God (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ) (1:4-5), and awaiting in eager expectation for the apocalyptic return of Christ in vv. 7-8 and the vindication of his Lordship in the renewal of all things.

However, this shared identity, this κοινωνία, is clearly threatened at Corinth. Paul invokes the name of the Lord Jesus in v. 10 in order to heal the σχίσματα (v.10) and the ἔριδες (v.11) that have developed among the Corinthians. As Paul observes, these divisions among the Corinthians who share a common confession of the Lordship of Christ have penetrated the very rite of baptism itself (1:13c, 15). Instead of ritually demarcating the *ekklesia* from οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι (1:18), οὗτος αἰὼν (1:20) and ἡ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου (1:20-21), Corinthian baptisms are creating new boundaries *within* the faith-community, forming groups within a group, and are thus in effect dividing Christ (1:13a). Paul responds with a rather blistering disavowal of their baptisms in 1:14-16, thanking God that he had not baptised any more than he seems to have reluctantly recalled, asserting that Christ had not sent him to baptise but to proclaim the gospel (1:17), the very message and power of God that should be unifying the Corinthians as brothers and sisters in Christ (1:18ff).

²⁵⁸ For an overview of the socio-economic and cultic contexts of Corinth, see Steven S. Friesen, et al (eds.), *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society* (Boston: Brill, 2010); Daniel Schowalter and Steven Friesen (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); Cameron and Miller (eds), *Redescribing Paul*. For an overview of the history of scholarship on the Corinthian correspondences, see Edward Adams and David G. Horrell (eds.), *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004).

Among the ten references to baptism in 1 Corinthians, six occur in 1 Cor 1:13-17 and are thus integrally related to Paul's immediate response to the divisive behaviour among the Corinthians described in vv. 11-12. However, Paul's rationale with respect to the relationship between baptism and the divisions is obscure. Was the baptism ritual being altered or abused by the Corinthians? What is the nature of Paul's thankfulness for having baptised so few at Corinth? And why does Paul draw what appears to be such a sharp distinction between baptism and evangelising in v. 17? Is Paul deemphasizing his role as baptiser, or the rite of baptism itself?

In this chapter, I shall first rehearse the attempts that have been made at explaining the relationship between baptism and the divisions at Corinth on the one hand, and the relationship between baptism in 1 Cor 1:10-17 and Paul's other baptismal references in 1 Corinthians and his wider corpus on the other hand. Having identified the gaps in these proposals, I shall then exposit a ritual theory that explains the reciprocal relationship between rituals and social order that I believe to be most relevant to the issues surrounding our present passage. I will then demonstrate links between ritual and social order in 1 Cor 1:10-17 which will account for the community dynamics at Corinth. My thesis is that the reciprocity between ritual and social order inherent in ritualised processes illuminates 1 Cor 1:10-17 as exemplifying two distinct social orders represented by two baptisms, baptism 'in the name of Christ' and what Paul rhetorically designates as baptism 'in the name of Paul'. Paul in a similar manner as in Galatians creates a dichotomy between two social orders, a dichotomy that does not pit baptism against the gospel but rather baptism with versus baptism without the gospel. By virtue of their behaviour, the Corinthians are in danger of jeopardising the apocalyptic significance of baptism and the cross of Christ which for Paul is the equivalent of returning the world to pre-messianic conditions. I therefore see 1 Cor 1:10-17 as a fairly explicit demonstration in Paul's writings that the apocalyptic significance of baptism obliges the baptised to live a concomitantly apocalyptic social and ethical life, while infidelity in post-baptismal social and ethical behaviour has the potential of compromising the apocalyptic integrity of the Christian baptism ritual.

3.2. A Survey of Proposals for Baptism in 1 Cor 1:10-17

We may divide the various interpretations of 1 Cor 1:10-17 into two main groups: i) those which attempt to answer the question as to the relationship between the baptism references in vv. 13-17 and the divisions in v. 12; and ii) those which attempt to account for Paul's rhetoric in vv. 13-17 while integrating that rhetoric with Paul's other references to baptism (cf. 1 Cor 6:11; 12:13; Gal 3:27; Rom 6:3-4). I shall look at each of these interpretations in turn.

3.2.1. Baptism as the Cause of Divisions and its Deniers

Though there is broad agreement among interpreters that the divisions in v. 12 involved allegiances indicative of Graeco-Roman patron-client relationships,²⁵⁹ there are various hypotheses as to the ways in which baptism may have contributed to these divisions. To date, there are three main proposals for baptism-based allegiances: the influence of the mystery cults, the hierarchical nature of ritual and the influence of Roman bathing practices. However, some scholars deny that baptism made any significant contribution to the divisions. We shall survey each of these proposals in turn in order to determine the extent to which baptism may have played a role in the divisions at Corinth.

3.2.1.1. The Influence of the Mystery Cults

Scholars such as Hans Conzelmann,²⁶⁰ C.K. Barrett,²⁶¹ and A.J.M. Wedderburn,²⁶² have posited that the special bond forged between the initiate and priest in the mystery religions may have influenced the practice and appropriation of baptisms at Corinth. The History-of-Religions School had laid the research foundation for exploring parallels between the practices constitutive of the mysteries and those of Pauline Christianity,²⁶³ and while many of their proposals have since been discredited, the reciprocity inherent in

²⁵⁹ See, e.g., John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. JSNTSup Series 75 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); L.L. Welborn, "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Cor 1-4 and Ancient Politics," *JBL* 106.1 (1987): 85-111; Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), 93-4, 102-4; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 19-35; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 55-58.

²⁶⁰ *1 Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 35.

²⁶¹ *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, second edition (London: A&C Black, 1971), 47.

²⁶² *Baptism*, 248-9.

²⁶³ Cf. the discussion in Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:148ff.

mystery cults has stood the test of time. Most recently, the mysteries hypothesis has come to the foreground in Stephen Chester's monograph on the dynamics of conversion evident in the Corinthian correspondence.²⁶⁴ Chester's study builds on what appears now to be a consensus on the nature of the factions at Corinth, namely, the households which were baptised together provided the social structure whereby divisions between heads of households would have been amplified by their *clientele* – extended family, slaves, freedmen, hired labourers and business associates.²⁶⁵ But why would this factionalism be associated with *baptism*? Stephen Chester has made the argument that the Corinthians appropriated their baptisms in a manner analogous to initiations associated with mystery cults. Chester argues that if baptism was understood by Paul to confer the Spirit in 1 Cor 12:13, then it is a short step to see how the Corinthians exploited this pneumatic conferral in accordance with the frames of reference indicative of Graeco-Roman initiations.²⁶⁶ Besides the potential semiotic affinities between some mystery purifications and Christian baptism,²⁶⁷ initiation into mystery cults created a special tie between the initiate and the priest performing the rite, such as Lucius' reference to the priest Mithras as 'father' in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 11.25, 21, and the various inscriptions to the 'fathers' of Isiac collegia.²⁶⁸ It is this relationship that can account for the loyalty factions that developed at Corinth around the initiation rite, which Chester speculates may have centered on the three persons Paul had baptised, Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas.²⁶⁹

Furthermore, initiation into the mysteries served as a means for divine favor potentially manifested in social advancement. Here Chester draws from the latest research into mystery religions that have, for all practical purposes, debunked earlier theories of a magical sacramental initiation that united the participant with the dying and rising of a god.²⁷⁰ Instead, mystery cults may have represented more of a means to gain divine favor and advantage as potentially reflected in social and financial status. Again in

²⁶⁴ *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 267-316.

²⁶⁵ Chester, *Conversion* 294; cf. David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 117.

²⁶⁶ Chester, *Conversion*, 282-3.

²⁶⁷ Cf. the washings associated with the Isis cult in *Metamorphoses* Book 11, the Eleusinian mysteries, etc. See the list of extant mystery cults in Corinth compiled by Chester, *Conversion*, 303-316.

²⁶⁸ See Chester, *Conversion*, 291, n.84 for further references.

²⁶⁹ Chester, *Conversion*, 293-4.

²⁷⁰ Chester, *Conversion*, 267-74.

the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, Lucius attributes “a successful legal career to the goodwill of Isis and that of her consort Osiris (11.6, 28). In effect, the divine couple became his patrons, granting blessings in return for continued devotion.”²⁷¹ As Wedderburn notes, this union with the divine found in the mystery cults “involves not so much a change of nature or substance as a change of status and potential.”²⁷² This association between initiation and social advancement could account for the Corinthian sense of exalted spiritual status in 2:1-16.

3.2.1.2. The Hierarchical Nature of Rituals

As an alternative to the mystery cult hypothesis, Richard DeMaris’ monograph on ritual in the NT uses ritual theory to explain the divisions at Corinth. He sees 1 Cor 1:10-17 as evidence against the consensus view that baptism was, by the time of Paul, the universal and self-evident rite of initiation among early Christians.²⁷³ Instead, DeMaris argues that 1 Corinthians gives evidence that baptism was in fact the cause of controversy rather than the amelioration of it. He faults commentators who too easily dismiss Paul’s forgetting whom he baptised as an anomaly specific to the Corinthian situation.²⁷⁴ DeMaris argues that Paul’s forgetfulness in fact “betrays uneasiness about his involvement in baptism and his unhappiness that the rite has contributed to divisiveness among the Corinthian house churches and within them (1:10-13)... A few verses later, in 1:17, it becomes abundantly clear that he is trying to distance himself from baptism altogether when he makes the surprising claim ... that he was sent to proclaim but not to baptize... Paul certainly does not take baptism for granted in the opening chapters of 1 Corinthians...”²⁷⁵ DeMaris accounts for the allegiances forged at baptism by noting that rituals have the effect of creating not merely social relationships but social *hierarchies*. Quoting Catherine Bell, DeMaris observes, “Ritual practices are themselves the very production and negotiation of power relations.”²⁷⁶ Thus, the practice of submitting oneself to a baptism at the hand of another “expressed and established a ranking between

²⁷¹ Chester, *Conversion*, 272-3.

²⁷² Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 341; Chester, *Conversion*, 279-80.

²⁷³ *New Testament*, 15-20.

²⁷⁴ DeMaris, *New Testament*, 16.

²⁷⁵ DeMaris, *New Testament*, 16.

²⁷⁶ Bell, *Ritual*, 81, 196; DeMaris, *New Testament*, 30.

baptizand and baptizer.”²⁷⁷ As conflict arises from members of the community dissenting from the distinctions and hierarchies that the ritual creates, we can then see how Paul would distance himself from baptismal practices that contributed to the formation of these competing circles.

3.2.1.3. The Influence of Roman Bathing Practices

In a response to DeMaris’ hypothesis that baptism in Corinth may have been a ritualised subversion of Roman imperial ideology, J. Brian Tucker proposes examining Corinthian baptism in light of Roman bathing practices.²⁷⁸ Building on the original proposal of Eduard Stommel in 1959 and its development in the work of the liturgiologist, Bryan Spinks, Tucker explores the patronage connections inherent in Roman bathing practices and its potential impact on early Christian baptism. Specifically, the *clientele* relationships inherent in Roman recreational washing “were imposed on the relationship between the baptisand and the officiant of the identity-forming rite.”²⁷⁹ This observation entails the fact that, contra DeMaris, far from subverting or resisting Roman imperial ideology, the hierarchical, status-oriented ideology inherent in Roman bathing practices was in fact affirmed in Corinthian baptism and thus contributed to the divisions within the Corinthian community.

3.2.2. The Denial of the Role of Baptism

There have been as of late several historical reconstructions of the Corinthian context that marginalise or deny the role of baptism in the formation of the divisions, turning their attention more to social and economic factors as potential causes for their factionalism. L.L. Welborn has argued that partisanship, patronage and politics were all involved in the divisions, interpreting *σχίσμα* as evidence that the Corinthian church was comprised of “factions engaged in a struggle for power,” noting that *μερίς* is a common term for “party” in Greek (cf. Plb. 8.21.9).²⁸⁰ Welborn in the process ignores the role of

²⁷⁷ DeMaris, *New Testament*, 30.

²⁷⁸ J. Brian Tucker, “Baths, Baptism, and Patronage: The Continuing Role of Roman Social Identity in Corinth,” in Kathy Ehrensperger and J. Brian Tucker (eds), *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation*, LNTS, 428 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 173-88.

²⁷⁹ Tucker, “Baths,” 175.

²⁸⁰ Welborn, “On the Discord,” 87. Cf. M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 68, 70; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 33 sees ‘party allegiance’ behind the

baptism altogether. Andrew Clarke's influential monograph argues that the social prestige and patronage based on economic status in the Roman world began forging competing alignments within the Corinthian church.²⁸¹ Thus, for Clarke, baptism at the hands of another could have easily been interpreted in terms of the formation of patronal relationships.²⁸² Christof Strüder, like Welborn, ignores baptism altogether and instead opts for understanding the division between the Corinthians as an inchoate clash over preferred authorities.²⁸³

Each of these socio-economic proposals marginalises or ignores entirely a role baptism may have played in the divisions, and as a result, they offer little rationale for Paul's several-fold reference to baptism in 1:13-17. The lacuna left by these recent studies has inspired Maria Pascuzzi to find an alternative understanding for the baptised-based allegiances at Corinth.²⁸⁴ Pascuzzi rejects Chester's attempt to revive the explanation for the baptism-based allegiances provided by the mystery rituals in that she finds the supposed parallels with the mysteries unpersuasive. In particular, Pascuzzi is unconvinced about the special bond forged between the initiator and initiate in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, book 11, Chester's most significant piece of evidence. Instead, Pascuzzi argues that there is nothing in the passage to indicate that baptism itself was causing the problems. Pascuzzi posits that Paul may have been responding to an Apollos-party that accused him of being a 'mere baptiser', thus accounting for his baptism-gospel antithesis in v. 17.²⁸⁵ The advantage of Pascuzzi's hypothesis is two-fold: first, it situates the role of baptism within the relational dynamics between Paul and Apollos, which looms large in Corinth (1:12; 3:4-6, 22; 4:6; 16:12),²⁸⁶ secondly, this reconstruction is able to account for why Paul drops the whole discussion over the role of the baptiser after v. 17.

divisions; so, too, Chester, *Conversion*, 241-2.

²⁸¹ Clarke, *Secular*, 102-4; cf. Witherington, *Conflict*, 19-35; Martin, *Corinthian Body* 55-58; Edward Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 89.

²⁸² Clarke, *Secular*, 93.

²⁸³ Christof W. Strüder, "Preferences not Parties: the Background of 1 Cor 1,12," *ETL* 79 (2003) 431-55, esp. 432, 447.

²⁸⁴ Maria Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance and the Divisions in Corinth: A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 1:13-17," *CBQ* 71.4 (2009) 813-29.

²⁸⁵ Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 822-28.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Corin Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4* (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2009).

Pascuzzi's dismissal of a special relationship forged between initiate and initiator in the mysteries goes against the grain of recent scholarship. For example, Richard Gordon has highlighted how individual Fathers in Mithraic congregations expected deference in light of their contributions and donations (such as cult furniture).²⁸⁷ He notes an inscription in Ostia where one Diocles dedicated his altar to Mithras *ob honorem C. Lucreti Menandri Patris*, as a mark of respect to the Father of the congregation (*CIMRM* 225). A secret utterance known as the Mithraic *symbolon* addresses the initiate as συνδέξειε πατρός ἀγαθοῦ, 'hand-shaker' of an illustrious Father (Firmicus Maternus, *De errore* 5.2). And the best-preserved lines at S. Prisca request that the *sanctus Pater*, the reverend Father, should 'receive the Lions as they offer incense', *accipe thuridremos ... accipe Leones* (lines 16f.). Thus Gordon concludes: "All this suggests that we should think of relations within Mithraic congregations at least partly in terms of patronage."²⁸⁸ Further, Pascuzzi does not address what members of the Corinthian church would have considered a 'mere baptiser' to have been, nor does she explain how such a slogan could be attributed plausibly to Paul who founded the church at Corinth.

More importantly, Pascuzzi offers a false dichotomy. There is no reason to account for the divisions in 1:12 in an either/or manner, entirely socio-economic factors or ritual factors, since the social and the ritual intertwine. DeMaris has demonstrated amply how social hierarchies established in ritual can be the occasion for conflict, and the ubiquity of patronage arrangements among social interactions in rituals and bathing would have rendered baptism vulnerable to such misappropriations. We are on relatively sure footing, given the Graeco-Roman proclivity to social hierarchies and the establishment of hierarchies embedded in ritualised activity, in positing that the baptisms at Corinth made at least some contribution to the divisions within the Corinthian community. If we had to choose between the frames of reference constitutive of the mystery rituals or Roman public bathing practices, the role of the Spirit in baptism (see 12:13 below), which Tucker does not consider, would tip the scale toward the mysteries, and thus the dynamics constitutive of the mystery cults would be more conducive to Christian washings than the patronage inherent in Roman bathing practices. The problem, however, is that even if we

²⁸⁷ Richard Gordon, "Institutionalized Religious Options: Mithraism," in Jörg Rüpke (ed), *A Companion to Roman Religion* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 392-405.

²⁸⁸ "Institutionalized," 402.

are able to approximate the cause of these divisions, we still have to account for Paul's rhetoric in vv. 13-17. Why is Paul thankful he baptised so few (1:14)? What does he mean by baptism 'in the name of Paul' (1:15)? Why does he draw such a sharp distinction between baptising and evangelising in v. 17a?

3.3. Accounting for Paul's Attitude toward Baptism

The foregoing questions are the topic of the second group of interpretive proposals. Alongside the ambiguity on the relationship between baptism and the Corinthian divisions are questions concerning the nature of Paul's 'thankfulness' that he didn't participate in more baptisms than he did in v. 14, his 'forgetfulness' of who he baptised in v. 16, and the baptism-gospel dichotomy in 1:17a. The problem is that an apparent discrepancy emerges when these verses are set beside Paul's other allusions to baptism that appear to ascribe a high degree of significance to the ritual (cf. 1 Cor 6:11; 12:13; Gal 3:27; Rom 6:3-4). Some scholars have taken care to point out that the apparent depreciation of baptism in this pericope is not representative of Paul's view of baptism. Beasley-Murray, commenting on what appears to be Paul's relativising of baptism in comparison with the importance of proclaiming the gospel in 1:17, writes: "If this is not a minimizing of the significance of baptism, it seems perilously close to it."²⁸⁹ Yet, Beasley-Murray notes that "the man who formulated the baptismal theology reflected in Rom. 6.1ff, Gal. 3.26 f, Col. 2.11f did not think lightly of baptism and would not have wished to give the impression that he did."²⁹⁰ Conzelmann claims that this verse emphasises Paul's work as a proclaimer of the gospel, not a baptiser, and therefore Paul "does not devalue baptism, but defines the personal commission to which Paul is subject."²⁹¹ So, too, Schrage, who states: "Nicht Zeitnot und nicht Geringschätzung der Taufe oder des »Organisatorischen« gegenüber dem »Geistigen«, sondern rechte Selbsteinschätzung und Selbstbeschränkung des Paulus ergibt sich aus V 17a."²⁹² Thiselton is more nuanced, noting that since baptism and the Lord's Supper each proclaim ritually the gospel of Christ's death and resurrection (Rom 6:3-11; 1 Cor 11:24-

²⁸⁹ *Baptism*, 178.

²⁹⁰ *Baptism*, 178-9.

²⁹¹ *1 Corinthians*, 36; cf. David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 53.

²⁹² *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1Kor 1,1-6.11)*; EKKNT VII/1 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger/Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 157.

27), then Paul is distancing himself from the *performance* of baptisms, “with its emphasis on ministerial agency.”²⁹³

Other scholars are not so convinced and have instead taken Paul’s comments to be a clear indicator that baptism was not particularly important to Paul. C.K. Barrett, commenting on 1:17, writes: “I cannot understand 1 Cor 1:14-17 as implying anything less than a relative depreciation of baptism.”²⁹⁴ G. Barth sees Paul as subsuming or subordinating baptism to evangelising.²⁹⁵ James Dunn argues that 1 Cor 1:10-17 indicates that “Paul himself was evidently anxious lest the Corinthians make a false or too high evaluation of their baptism. ... In each case Paul deliberately deemphasizes baptism. ... He could recall baptizing only Crispus and Gaius, and he almost forgot to mention the household of Stephanas (1.14-16) – so, not a series of particularly significant or memorable events so far as Paul himself was concerned. So far as he was concerned, his mission was to preach the gospel, not to baptize (1.17) – an interesting comment on the role and relative importance attributed by Paul to baptism within the complex of conversion and initiation.”²⁹⁶ Ben Witherington begins his chapter on Pauline baptism by commenting: “1 Corinthians says clearly and succinctly that Paul is glad he did not baptize more Corinthians, but we surely cannot imagine him ever saying ‘I thank God I did not convert more Corinthians’ ... Clearly, baptism is not at the top of Paul’s list of things to worry about.”²⁹⁷

There is, however, a fundamental problem with this line of interpretation. Dunn alludes to the problem when he comments that the Corinthians thought that baptism (and the Lord’s Supper) provided “a kind of spiritual inoculation and guarantee against subsequent rejection by God.”²⁹⁸ Witherington, too, dismisses what he calls “the overly magical or overly sacramental view of baptism” at Corinth.²⁹⁹ Dunn’s allusion to what has been termed a ‘magical sacramentalism’ on the part of the Corinthians is inextricably

²⁹³ A. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Publishing Company, 2000), 143.

²⁹⁴ *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament* (Exeter: Paternoster/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), 66.

²⁹⁵ Barth, *Taufe*, 103.

²⁹⁶ *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 449-50.

²⁹⁷ Ben Witherington, III, *Troubled Waters: The Real New Testament Theology of Baptism* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 79.

²⁹⁸ *Theology of Paul*, 449.

²⁹⁹ *Troubled Waters*, 80.

linked to a supposed over-realised, or what Fee calls “spiritualised,” eschatology at Corinth.³⁰⁰ Because they associate the presence of the Spirit with the eschaton, the Corinthians believe they are experiencing life in the present on a higher spiritual plane above the material and physical. It is the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s supper that guarantee this present experience of salvation and thus provide a guarantee of future salvation, irrespective of their moral behaviour.³⁰¹

However, it is precisely this over-realised eschatology that has been called into question as of late. The groundbreaking work of John Barclay has demonstrated that the Corinthians are not guilty of over-realised eschatology but rather of not sharing Paul’s apocalyptic framework for history where the future will be radically different than the present.³⁰² Paul’s rhetoric toward the believers at Corinth evidences that he finds their attitudes and practices far too accepting of the practices and beliefs characteristic of the Graeco-Roman world. The Corinthian church therefore lacked sufficient social and ethical *boundaries* between themselves and the wider Graeco-Roman world. Their factions over leaders in 1:10-12 (cf. 3:3-5) is but a prelude to a whole list of problems within the nascent Christian community: there are disputes between litigants in 6:1-8, a conflict between the ‘Weak’ and the ‘Strong’ over εἰδωλόθυτα in chapters 8-10, and shameful exclusions over the Lord’s Supper in 11:17-34. Hence, those Corinthians who consider themselves πνευματικοί and ψυχικοί “practise their faith while remaining fully integrated into Corinthian society, taking part in the social, economic, civic, legal and even religious aspects of life in the city.”³⁰³ This reassessment of the Corinthian social context has in effect pulled the rug out from under not only the magical sacramentalist hypothesis, but also many of the proposals that attempt to account for Paul’s apparent relativisation of baptism. In light of Paul’s concerns over social and ethical boundaries, what the above baptismal interpretations would in effect amount to is that Paul is attempting to strengthen and fortify the social and ethical boundaries around the

³⁰⁰ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 12; cf. Anthony C. Thiselton, “Realized Eschatology at Corinth,” *NTS* 24:4 (1978): 510-26.

³⁰¹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 167; cf. Chester, *Conversion*, 337-8.

³⁰² John M.G. Barclay, “Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity,” *JSNT* 47 (1992) 49-74, 64.

³⁰³ Adams, *Constructing*, 100; cf. Barclay, “Thessalonica,” 70. See, too, C.K. Robertson, *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 28, 98; Meeks, *First Urban*, 107; Mihaila, *Paul-Apollos*, 107-8.

Corinthians while at the same time deemphasizing or undermining the distinctly Christian boundary-forming processes entailed in baptism, resulting in an incoherent analysis of the relationship between baptism and the Corinthian epistolary context.

In sum, two approaches – divisions and discrepancies – represent the main attempts at explaining the role of baptism in this pericope. Our concern is to examine the text in light of a ritual logic that accounts for the relationship between baptism and the social factions on the one hand while relating baptism to the overall Corinthian situation, which is the strengthening and fortifying of social and ethical boundaries circumscribing the *ekklesia*. With these two goals in mind, we shall examine the reciprocity that exists between the socio-ethical order of a people group and their ritualised activity. I will then argue that this reciprocity sheds new light on the role of baptism in Paul's understanding of the divisions at Corinth as well as the logic of his response.

3.4. Rituals and Social Order

For Rappaport, all ritualised social orders entail what he terms 'ultimate sacred postulates'.³⁰⁴ A postulate is sacred if it has the quality of absolute unquestionableness and certainty.³⁰⁵ What is interesting about ultimate sacred postulates is that they are generally highly abstract, that is, they are full of meaning but devoid of rational falsification or empirical verification, such as the Hebrew *Shema*: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One." The lack of empirical reference is intrinsic to the term "postulate" itself, in that to postulate is to claim without demonstration. Yet, it is precisely this lack of specificity that accounts for the postulate's *certainty*, or, in Rappaport's words: "the unfalsifiable ... yields the unquestionable."³⁰⁶ This is because the power or efficacy of an ultimate sacred postulate resides in its ritualised utterance; that is, the ritual performance constitutes the factuality, the truth, of the postulate so proclaimed. Rappaport gives the example of the medieval Catholic Mass, the performance of which "establishes as a social fact the existence of the God in whose name men are elevated to such conventional offices as kingship, through such conventional procedures as crowning, anointing, and oathtaking."³⁰⁷ Because ultimate

³⁰⁴ *Ritual*, 263ff.

³⁰⁵ *Ritual*, 281, 283.

³⁰⁶ *Ritual*, 217.

³⁰⁷ *Ritual*, 279.

sacred postulates are established as social and cosmic facts by the performance of ritual, they may be ignored, as is the case today with Zeus' Lordship, but at no point are they actually falsified, since their truthfulness is established in the unique state of affairs that constitutes ritual performance.

Ultimate sacred postulates in turn sanctify the cosmic and social orders of a population, which is another way of saying that they legitimise as natural and unquestionable the power arrangements, economic structures and other relations inherent in any given society. Ultimate sacred postulates do not give instructions on how to organise society; instead, they invest other postulates, what Rappaport terms "cosmological axioms," with a concomitant sanctity, a derived unquestionableness proportionate to the ultimate sacred postulates with which they are related.³⁰⁸ It is the function of these axioms to establish social order among a people group in such a way that the king, for example, is not merely invested with authority but so are his proclamations and directives. As such, ultimate sacred postulates and cosmological axioms constitute a regulatory hierarchy that organises a population into a particular kind of social order, investing the specific rules governing the conduct of relations among the persons, qualities, conditions and states of affairs with a derivative degree of authority.³⁰⁹ These rules are expressed both in ritual and in the transactions of everyday life, and in effect "transform cosmology into conduct."³¹⁰

An important constituent to this social model is the reciprocity between the material and social conditions and the integrity of the ultimate sacred postulates as embodied by ritual participants. What Rappaport observed was that material and social conditions effect the willingness of members of the community to participate in the rituals which establish the truthfulness of the ultimate sacred postulates from which the material and social conditions are derived.³¹¹ This means that the integrity and veracity of the ultimate sacred postulate, though endowed with the property of absolute unquestionableness, is nevertheless contingent upon and is thus effected by the acceptance of such a postulate on the part of ritual participants. If the ritual participants change or challenge the social order that is established by the ultimate sacred postulate, then they are in fact 'de-sanctifying'

³⁰⁸ *Ritual*, 263ff.

³⁰⁹ *Ritual*, 263-76; "Cognized," 119-120.

³¹⁰ "Cognized," 120.

³¹¹ *Ritual*, 429-37.

the regulatory hierarchy and jeopardizing the sanctity of the postulate from which the regulative structure is derived. A challenge to the social order therefore is a challenge to the ultimate sacred postulate upon which that order is based.

What is essential to grasp from Rappaport's ritual theory is that ritual participants can affect adversely the integrity of the ritual; specifically, participants can either promote or challenge the veracity or plausibility of a ritual's defining ultimate sacred postulates by promoting or challenging the social order that is engendered by the ritual. It is this reciprocity between the ritual order and the social order embodied by ritual participants that provides a ritual theory that may be fruitful in explaining the social dynamics between Paul, the Corinthians and baptism in 1 Cor 1:10-17.

3.5. A Ritualised Community at Corinth

Recently, scholars have begun to question whether an actual Christian community ever existed at Corinth. Mitchell notes that historically, the church at Corinth may never have been a corporate unity prior to Paul's letter, and Stan Stowers has been a critic of the way a unified 'community' has simply been assumed in Corinthian scholarship such that the various dynamics involved in the diverse social strata, particularly as such strategies constituted different reasons of attraction to Paul's gospel among the Corinthians, have been completely ignored.³¹² However, I will argue that 1 Cor 1:10-17 evidences that Paul presupposes a real corporate unity among the Corinthians. By 'community', I am not referring to a highly organised social complex, a phenomenon that usually takes considerable time to develop, but to a far more basic social aggregate that shares common boundaries, practices, beliefs and goals that are arranged, organised and expressed in a common ritual order.³¹³ It is in the context of these shared rituals that Paul sees manifested the communal ideal to which the Corinthians are to aspire for every aspect of their lives. In contrast to this ritualised unity, the Corinthians are practicing a social order indicative of the status and patronage values of the Graeco-Roman world that contradicts the Christ-centered social order entailed in their baptisms. It is the conflict

³¹² Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 1, 75-6 n.62; Stowers, "Kinds of Myth," 108-9.

³¹³ Catherine Bell, *Ritual, passim*; Turner, *The Ritual Process*, 131-65. For the various conceptions and models for community in Paul, see Stephen C. Barton, "The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity," *JTS* 43 (1992): 399-427.

between these two competing social orders that accounts for both the relationship between baptism and divisions on the one hand and Paul's rhetoric in vv. 10-17 on the other.

3.6. Baptism 'in the Name of Christ'

Paul's first mention of baptism in the Corinthian correspondence is as the last of a series of three interrogatives in v. 13, which is Paul's initial response to the factions or rivalries (ἔριδες) among the Corinthians in v. 11: μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; μή Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε;. That μεμέρισται³¹⁴ appears in the vast majority of early texts without the preceding μή (contra P46) complicates its relation to the two subsequent questions.³¹⁵ If the first question is taken literally, without an implied μή, then, as Lightfoot noted, the answer is obviously 'yes', Christ is divided in their factionalism.³¹⁶ However, the majority of scholars appropriate v. 13a as a constituent of the two other interrogatives as each of the three form a *reductio ad absurdum*, the purpose of which is to force the Corinthians to acknowledge the absurdity of their divisions.³¹⁷ As Thiselton writes: "The reference to the crucifixion demonstrates beyond question the absurdity and indeed 'sinfulness' of daring to put loyalty to human leaders on the same level as loyalty to Christ."³¹⁸ The absurdity of Paul's crucifixion on their behalf (ὑπὲρ) is paralleled with the third of the *reductio* catena, baptism 'in the name of Paul'. The *reductio* effect requires that baptisms were not actually performed 'in the name of Paul' at Corinth any more than Paul was actually crucified on their behalf; the Corinthians were in fact baptised 'in the name of Christ' (cf. 6:11).³¹⁹ The allusion to

³¹⁴ The term μερίζω refers to their disunity (1 Cor 7:34; Mark 3:24-26; Matt 12:25-26; Ign. *Magn.* 6:2). Cf. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 51.

³¹⁵ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 136.

³¹⁶ J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries* (London: Macmillan, 1895), 154; so, too, Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 51. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 35, sees an implicit reference to the church as the body of Christ in this phrase as per 1 Cor 12:12, in that both passages, Paul uses what he otherwise seldom does, the definite article ὁ Χριστός (cf. *1 Corinthians*, 35; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 137).

³¹⁷ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 134, 136-8; Witherington, *Conflict*, 103; Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiance," 814; etc. The use of μή preceding Paul is a common way of formulating a question which invites a negative answer, rhetorically implying its own negative proposition (Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 137).

³¹⁸ *First Epistle*, 137.

³¹⁹ Cf. Barth, *Taufe*, 44-6; Chester, *Conversion*, 292. Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 23, argues that εἰς in baptismal contexts suggests location rather than movement, citing εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν (1 Cor 10:2) as an example of a 'sign of adherence to Moses', such that baptism in the name of Christ involves identity with Christ, that is, belonging to Christ (cf. 18-19). So, too, Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 35. Thiselton qualifies

baptism ‘in the name of Christ’ echoes Paul’s previous plea (παρακαλῶ) in v. 10 where he invokes the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) as the foundation and instrument through which their problems can be resolved (cf. 1 Cor 4:15).³²⁰ For as 1:1-9 makes clear, it is Christ that defines Corinthian unity: in Christ they are ‘sanctified’ (ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, v. 2), they call upon the one and same Lord Christ (σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, v. 2), the divine grace in which they all share was a gift of Christ (v. 3-5), Christ is their shared testimony (v. 6) and the one around whom they have been called into fellowship (ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, v. 9). It is in Christ, therefore, that their divisions may be healed (κατηρτισμένοι, v. 10).³²¹

With the invocation of the Lordship of Christ, we therefore have before us the Pauline equivalent of an ‘ultimate sacred postulate’, an unquestionably certain ground by which commensurate cosmological, social and ethical orders are legitimised and normalised. As we saw in our analysis of baptism in Galatians, baptisms were Christian only to the extent that the name of the Lord Jesus was declared over the baptised (cf. 1 Cor 1:13c; 6:11). The annunciation of the Lordship of Christ over the baptised (cf. Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48), itself historically rather unique with regard to a verbal accompaniment to ritual washings,³²² would have the performative effect of bringing to bear upon the baptised not only the power of the exalted Jesus (e.g. 1 Cor 3:23; Gal 3:29), the very power that brought the Corinthian *ekklesia* into being (1 Cor 1:18, 25), but also the power to penetrate and sanctify the cosmic, cultural and ethical identities commensurate with this distinctly Christian ultimate sacred postulate.

Paul’s reference to baptism in the name of Christ in v. 13c is situated in immediate proximity to the allusion to Christ’s cross in v. 13b.³²³ The precise relationship between Christ’s death and the baptism ritual, particularly as the two themes are conjoined in Rom

the locative εἰς by noting that baptism does involve the transition from one realm to another, as does the baptism ‘into Moses’ in 1 Cor 10:1-4. This would account for the interchangeability between εἰς and ἐν with regard to baptism in Christ’s name (cf. 6:11; Acts 10:48). Thiselton thus opts for a primary meaning of ‘direction’ or ‘relation’, and secondary meaning of ‘movement into another sphere’ (*First Epistle*, 138-9).

³²⁰ Cf. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 41, who sees the invocation of the ‘the name of the Lord Jesus Christ’ in v. 10 as a deliberate echo of the name into which the Corinthians were baptised.

³²¹ The term κατηρτισμένοι was used as a metaphor for mending or repairing broken relationships. See Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 74-5; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 43; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 115; Hays, *First Epistle*, 21.

³²² See above.

6:1-4, has been the subject of wide-ranging discussion.³²⁴ However, understood as an ultimate sacred postulate, the cross of Christ would by its nature engender a social order. Here, in the Corinthian context, this is precisely what we see: the proclamation of Christ's cross generates a particular kind of people group set apart from the dominant society. Paul develops the cross motif in vv. 18-31 within an apocalyptic two-age framework characteristic of early Judaism, similar to what we encountered in Galatians, the cross providing the point of demarcation between the *ekklesia* and 'those who are perishing' (1:18), 'this age' (1:20), and 'the wisdom of the world' (1:21).³²⁵ That this people group involves a distinct worshipping community is implied in 1:24, where Paul brings back the *καλέω* motif from v. 2, noting that the cross, while foolishness to Greeks and a stumbling block to Jews, is manifested as 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God' for τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν.

The social order entailed in the ultimate sacred postulate of the cross of Christ bridges the cross and baptism, in that our present passage evidences that baptism 'in the name of Christ' was the ritualised means by which this social order came into being. Early Christian baptisms involved at least *two* persons, the baptised and a baptiser (1:14-16), a feature unique to Christians among the various forms of ritual washing in Second Temple Judaism save for John the Baptist.³²⁶ Since there is no baptising oneself, early Christian identity was *received from another*, with baptisms thus exemplifying vividly the mutuality and dependence that Paul expects to characterise and unify the *ekklesia* (1:10;

³²³ Fee, *First Epistle*, 61, notes that the death of Christ and baptism seem "to flow together naturally in Paul (e.g. Rom 6:2-3; Col 2:12-15)." Cf. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:153-4.

³²⁴ Among the various rationales for the association between baptism and death: (1) Water was associated with the kingdom of the dead in ancient mythology (cf. E. Ferguson, "Baptismal Motifs in the Ancient Church," in idem [ed], *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church*, [New York: Garland Publishing, 1993], 352-66; 359. (2) Greeks saw death as liberation for the soul from its physical bondage (Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 65). (3) From the vantage point of ritual studies, Eliade observes: "Immersion is the equivalent, at the human level, of death at the cosmic level, of the cataclysm (the Flood) which periodically dissolves the world into the primeval ocean. Breaking up all forms, doing away with the past, water possesses this power of purifying, of regenerating, of giving new birth. ... Water purifies and regenerates because it nullifies the past, and restores – even if only for a moment – the integrity of the dawn of things" (Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, [New York, Sheed & Ward, 1958], 194). (4) Some scholars, in noting the association between death and burial and baptism, see a parallel between dying with Christ and immersion, burial and submersion, and being raised with Christ and emersion (cf. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998], 309). For a survey of baptism in the history of interpretation of Romans 6, see Søren Agersnap, *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6.1-14* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999), 16-41; Hendrikus Boers, "The Structure and Meaning of Romans 6:1-14," CBQ 63.4 (2001): 664-682.

³²⁵ Adams, *Constructing*, 98, 107-8.

³²⁶ Taylor *The Immerser*, 50.

12:25-27; 13:1-13).³²⁷ The social nature of baptism is further exemplified by Paul's recounting of a household baptism in 1:16a, perhaps a ritualised expression of their corporate filial union as ἀδελφοί (1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; cf. Gal 3:26-29) constituting them as ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (1:2). The performance of the baptism rite can thus be seen as the faith-community in microcosm, the initial ritualised act constituting an extension and thus an anticipation of the customs and practices, the inner-life, shared by those 'called into fellowship with God the Father and his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord' (1:9).³²⁸

Thus, 1 Cor 1:10-17 exemplifies a reciprocal dynamic between ritual and social order which provides an important insight into Paul's understanding of community-dynamics at Corinth. Paul *presupposes* a real corporate unity, a shared lifeworld united and identified in Christ, *as such appears manifested in their life of corporate worship* (1:2, 9, 13c). The ritual practices participated in by each of the Corinthian believers involves for Paul the production of a Christological reality in time and space that transforms them into the 'body of Christ' as implied in the rhetorical question of 1:13a: μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; As we shall see in Paul's development of the 'body of Christ' motif in 1 Corinthians 12, this shared ritual life entails the overturning and inverting of prevailing mores inherent in the wider Graeco-Roman social order. It is rituals constitutive of the 'body of Christ', not the practices and beliefs of the Graeco-Roman world, that define the corporate identity of the Corinthians and thus provide an objective reality to which their relationships in mundane time and space are obliged to conform.

3.7. Baptism 'in the Name of Paul'

And yet, in an almost perplexing move, rather than calling the Corinthians back to their baptismal identities united in Christ, Paul distances himself from their baptisms. The asyndetic εὐχαριστῶ or 'thanksgiving'³²⁹ that Paul baptised οὐδένα or 'none' of the Corinthians in v. 14 appears as the immediate consequence of the absurdities in v. 13, the

³²⁷ With any explicit information on qualification or authorisation related to baptisers, we are left with little more than conjecture on these issues. It appears from our passage that, at the very least, baptism was associated with renowned figures in the *ekklesia* (Paul, Cephas, Apollo, etc.). See the discussion on 'party' leaders as baptisers in Chester, *Conversion*, 293-4.

³²⁸ See further DeMaris, *The New Testament*, 21-26, for a development of the ritual significance of baptism for ameliorating the social crises associated with kinship-breaking and -making in the Graeco-Roman and Jewish world.

³²⁹ ⲙ*, B, 6, 424^c, and 1739 all omit τῷ θεῷ (Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 140).

last of which is repeated in the subordinate clause of v. 15, εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε. This refrain in v. 15 involves understanding the role baptism ‘in the name of Paul’ plays in Paul’s rhetoric. If we understand baptism ‘in the name of x’ as an ultimate sacred postulate, then, when Paul gives thanks in v. 14-15 that he did not participate in baptisms that would have been in effect baptisms ‘in the name of Paul’, he is in fact identifying the ritual washings at Corinth with an alternative ultimate sacred postulate. This is no mere rhetorical exaggeration on Paul’s part: in characterising some of these Corinthian baptisms as done ‘in the name of Paul’, *Paul is dislocating their baptisms from the defining characteristic of Christian baptism: the invocation of Christ’s name over the baptised.*

Of significance here is how ultimate sacred postulates engender their own cosmological and social orders. As I noted above, ultimate sacred postulates legitimise, naturalise, or, as Rappaport puts it, ‘sanctify’ social order and ethical behaviour, such that social arrangements and practices are governed by a commonly accepted conception of the sacred. Baptism ‘in the name of Paul’ would therefore serve as Paul’s assessment of the ritualised foundry, that source of accepted sanctity, most compatible with the Corinthians’ concern over prestige, patronage and social status. Baptism in effect has become a ritual that promotes, advocates and supports the values indicative of the Graeco-Roman social order. As such, these baptisms are in *social and ethical effect* (cf. vv. 10-12) no different from any other initiation or water washing in the Graeco-Roman world, and thus compromise the apocalyptic significance of the baptism ritual and the ultimate sacred postulate embedded within the washing, the death and Lordship of Christ (1:13), which in turn risks emptying the cross of its effect, its power, to overturn the ‘wisdom of the world’ in ushering in the messianic age (1:17-2:16). As such, Paul’s substitution of an alternative sacred postulate for baptism ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus’ draws out the reductio logic from v. 13 which was Paul’s rhetorical response to the divisions in v. 12: the Corinthians’ divisions in effect dissolve the Christological identity of their baptisms into the social and ethical characteristics of the Graeco-Roman world and thus undermine the power of the cross to overturn the ‘wisdom of the world’.³³⁰ The

³³⁰ Strüder argues that the purpose of vv. 11-12 is to demonstrate the absurdity of relativising belonging to or being ‘of Christ’ to belonging to or allying oneself ‘to mere men’, thereby undermining the authority and saving work of Christ. The phrase Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ therefore “already alludes to the real

Corinthians' continued adherence to Graeco-Roman social values threatens the very ultimate sacred postulate pronounced at their baptisms, which in effect renders their baptisms as done in the name – and hence power – of *mere* men (i.e. 'in the name of Paul', 1:15; cf. 3:4-9, 21-22) and thus undermines the source of the very power of God they depend on for their exalted pneumatic status (2:1-16).

Having qualified the absolute negative in v. 14 (οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα) with the baptisms of Crispus and Gaius, we find Paul in v. 16 amplifying his qualification with his recollection that he did in fact baptise Stephanas' household. It is of course enticing to speculate that Stephanas, who was with Paul at the time of his writing the letter (16:17), directly reminded him of this. And the mentions of Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas further suggest that Paul baptised more than his given impression.³³¹ Crispus may well have been the former synagogue ruler who in Acts 18:8 believed with "all his household" and is baptised along with many of the Corinthians. As Pascuzzi posits, it is probable that Paul baptised Crispus, his household, and those believing Corinthians present with them.³³² Paul mentions the baptism of Gaius who, in Rom 16:23, was host to both Paul and the 'whole church'. Stephanas and his baptised οἶκος (1:16) are called by Paul the firstfruits of Achaia (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας) who devoted themselves to ministering (διακονία) to the church (1 Cor 16:15-16). This means that Gaius and Stephanas, along most likely with Crispus, were people of some social and economic standing, and Paul considered them key figures as they became the hosts of the congregation.³³³ Chester speculates that the three whom Paul recalls having baptised may have been 'party leaders', that is, "local Christians who legitimate their own power by appealing to renowned figures in the church."³³⁴ Using Jerome Murphy-O'Connor's estimate that the Corinthian church was comprised of approximately fifty members, Pascuzzi observes that just these baptismal events alone would have been a significant portion of the Corinthian circle.³³⁵

consequences of their behaviour and lays the foundation for his solution in 3,22-23" ("Preferences," 451).

³³¹ W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:157, suggests that Paul's general practice may have been to baptise only the first members of a church-community.

³³² "Baptism-based Allegiance," 824.

³³³ Karl Olav Sandnes, "Equality Within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspective on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family," in *Constructing Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London: Routledge, 1997), 150-65, 151-2.

³³⁴ Chester, *Conversion*, 293.

³³⁵ Pascuzzi, "Baptism-based Allegiances," 824; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (GNS 6; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1983), 156-8. For a critical evaluation of Murphy-O'Connor's archeological approach, see Daniel N. Schowalter, "Seeking Shelter in Roman Corinth:

Nevertheless, Paul's failed recollection on whom else he baptised has been interpreted as indicating baptism's relative insignificance to Paul.³³⁶ The context, however, is clear: Paul in v. 16 is amplifying the exception he made in v. 14b to the universal negative οὐδένα ὑμῶν or 'none of you' in v. 14a; he is simply not commenting on the significance of baptism. Indeed, Paul's comments in vv. 14-16 form what appears to be a chiasmic structure where Paul's memory lapse is parallel to his universal negative:

- A. εὐχαριστῶ [τῷ θεῷ] ὅτι οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα
 B. εἰ μὴ Κρίσπον καὶ Γάϊον
 C. ἵνα μὴ τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε
 B'. ἐβάπτισα δὲ καὶ τὸν Στεφανᾶ οἶκον
 A'. λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα εἴ τινα ἄλλον ἐβάπτισα

Though we can't be sure that Paul intends a chiasm here,³³⁷ such chiasmic logic would confirm what we have thus far seen in terms of the reciprocity between ritual and social order: Paul is less concerned with *whom* he baptised than he is with what some might *say* about the social order embedded in those baptisms, that they were performed for the benefaction and patronage of Paul.

It is this concern over the reciprocal relationship between baptism and the behaviour of the Corinthians that should govern our interpretation of the baptism-gospel contrast in v. 17a: οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλén με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. We can see here that, for Paul, the Corinthians' partisan behaviour not only subsumes the cross and baptism to Graeco-Roman norms, but in doing so such behaviour compromises Paul's own apostolic calling.³³⁸ We should therefore take care not to link v. 17a as a clause grounding (γάρ) solely for Paul's forgetfulness in v. 16, such that it would read: "I don't remember who I baptised, because Christ did not send me to baptise."³³⁹ Not only would this conflict with the logic of the passage, but it disregards the fact that v. 16 constitutes a

Archaeology and the Placement of Paul's Communities," in Friesen, *Corinth in Context*, 327-41, 329-32.

³³⁶ Fee, *First Epistle*, 62-3; Dunn, *Paul*, 450.

³³⁷ On the interpretation of chiasmus in Paul, see the nine criteria outlined in C.L. Blomberg, "The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1-7," *Criswell Theological Review* 4 (1989) 3-20; 4-8.

³³⁸ On Paul's self-identity as an apostle, see Karl Olav Sandnes, *Paul – One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-Understanding* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991).

³³⁹ On γάρ as a conjunction used to express cause, reason, clarification, or inference, see BDAG, 189.

subordinate clause (δέ) that functions as a further qualification of the absolute negative in v. 14 where Paul states explicitly that he is thankful that he did not participate in baptisms that could be legitimately interpreted as performed for the benefaction of Paul (v. 15). A more grammatically satisfying option is to take the γάρ of v. 17 as an explanatory elaboration marker for the whole subparagraph in vv. 14-16 centered on v. 15. This would mean that the ἵνα-clause in v. 15 and its *implied* contrast between baptism ‘in the name of Paul’ and baptism ‘in the name of Christ’ is expanded upon in v. 17a by Paul’s *explicit* contrast between two infinitives of purpose, βαπτίζειν and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.³⁴⁰ Baptism ‘in the name of Paul’, that is, the baptising of Graeco-Roman values, therefore, is mutually exclusive to the purpose for which Paul had been sent to the Corinthians as an apostle of Christ. This purpose is not to baptise but to proclaim the gospel (εὐαγγελίζομαι)³⁴¹ which, in the context of vv. 14-16, would mean a contrast between the proclamation of the gospel and an elided baptism ‘in the name of Paul’ supported by the parallel purpose clause in v. 15. Paul’s rhetoric since v. 13c already entails the contrast between a baptism *with* versus *without* the central postulate of the gospel, namely, the proclamation of the Lordship of Christ. This contrast between *two baptisms*, one with and one without the gospel, and their inherent mutually exclusive social orders, would then be made explicit in v. 17a.

We should note that there is nothing in the text to indicate that the conflict is between performing baptisms and proclaiming the gospel, especially in light of the fact that the gospel was proclaimed as part of performing a distinctly Christian baptism ritual.³⁴² Indeed, as v. 15 against the backdrop of v. 13c makes clear, the conflict is between *two* antithetical baptisms – one in which the apocalyptic integrity of the ritual is maintained and one in which it is compromised. As Paul has asserted here in vv. 10-16 and will expound on in 6:9-11, baptism in the name of Christ obligates the Corinthians to relativise all things to the cross and Lordship of Christ; the values, practices, beliefs and

³⁴⁰ On infinitives of purpose, see James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanhan, MD: University Press of America, 1979), 133-4.

³⁴¹ In both Jewish and Hellenistic usage, the term εὐαγγελίζομαι basically connotes proclaiming or receiving a good report or news such as liberation from enemies or deliverance from demonic powers (cf. Isa 52:7; 61:1; Nah 2:1; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 66; Josephus *Ant.* 7:245, 250; *B.J.* 3:503; etc). In its distinctly Christian usage, the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι and its nominal equivalent εὐαγγέλιον denote the salvific nature of the Christ-event (1 Cor 1:17; Gal 1:16, 23; 4:13; 2 Cor 10:16; Eph 3:8, etc.). See Gerhard Friedrich, *TDNT* “εὐαγγελίζομαι,” 2:707-37; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:157.

³⁴² Contra Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 143.

behaviours indicative of the Graeco-Roman world have all been overwhelmed by the kenotic love of Christ revealed on the cross. For reasons that will be fleshed out in 6:9-11 (see chapter 4 below), Paul sees the baptism event entailing an obligation on the part of the Corinthians to live a life concomitant with Christ's sacrificial love when he died 'for you' (v. 13b). This is why Paul's commission to proclaim the gospel in v. 17a involves an explicit relativising of even the *proclaimer* to the power of the cross in v. 17b. Thus Paul can draw out the baptism-gospel contrast in v. 17a with a further contrast, that is, a proclamation of the gospel οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου in v. 17b but rather in what we might term the μωρία τοῦ σταυροῦ or 'foolishness of the cross' in vv. 18ff. In contrast to the value placed on σοφία by the Corinthians (2:4-16; 3:22ff) and the status of those identified with such, Paul proclaims 'Christ crucified', a σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ that cannot be accounted for in this world and that offers no exalted status. It is the proclamation of the Lordship of Christ, this σοφία τοῦ σταυροῦ, that informs or specifies the performance of ritual washings as distinctly Christian, which is precisely the connection that Paul previously made in the last two of the three rhetorical questions in v. 13. Indeed, as Hartman observes, 'Christ crucified' in 1:13b is subsequently 'proclaimed as a gospel' in 1:17-25.³⁴³ In fact, the three motifs entailed in rhetorical interrogatives of v. 13 appear together again in v. 17: 'Christ', 'baptism' and 'the cross', all of which are conjoined in relationship to the proclamation of the gospel; hence Paul's thankfulness that as one sent to proclaim the gospel he did not participate in baptisms that could legitimately be interpreted as performed for his status and benefaction. Paul was not sent to baptise Graeco-Roman values, but rather to proclaim the inversion of those values in the foolishness of the cross. Thus, contrary to the interpretations surveyed above, Paul's critical assessment of their baptisms as performed 'in the name of Paul' means that the Corinthians are not overvaluing or overemphasising their baptisms; indeed the opposite is the case: they are *undervaluing* the social and ethical entailments of their apocalyptic initiations (cf. 1:18ff)!

Therefore, the fact that the gospel was proclaimed at the baptism rite renders implausible the attempt to read Paul as pitting baptism against the proclaiming of the

³⁴³ *Into the Name*, 61.

gospel, as if Paul was contrasting baptism with the gospel.³⁴⁴ Neither is the baptism-gospel contrast in v. 17 an attempt on the part of Paul to undermine or deemphasise baptism, nor is it indicative of the distinct commission of Paul per se. Rather, throughout vv. 10-17, Paul is contrasting baptism *with* versus baptism *without* the gospel, the former being the distinct characteristic of a Christian ritual washing and its peculiar ethical obligation, the latter representing the collapse of the ethical and social boundaries specific to the rite and to Paul's apocalyptic world.

3.8. Summary and Conclusions

1 Cor 1:10-17 is a text that exemplifies Paul's understanding of the integral relationship between the baptism ritual and the formation and maintenance of a distinct Christian social order. We found that the various interpretive proposals offered thus far fail to account for Paul's de-emphasis of baptism on the one hand and his call to stronger social and ethical boundaries on the other. Understanding Paul's words in light of a ritual theory that explained the reciprocity between ritual and social order, we found that Paul understood the Corinthians to constitute a distinctly Christian unified community in their shared ritual life which was to serve as a model for the totality of their lives. Participation in baptisms 'in the name of Christ' obligated the Corinthians to live out a shared social order defined by the ethos of the cross. However, the Corinthians were contradicting this ritualised community by their divisions and conflicts centered on status and patronage. Paul interprets the Corinthians' factional behaviour as nothing less than a challenge to the ultimate sacred postulate of a distinctly Christian social order and thus characterises their

³⁴⁴ Mauro Pesce's article on 1 Cor 1:17 argues unsuccessfully that Paul's intransitive use of the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is a technical term for the proclamation of the gospel directed towards non believers, not towards those already in Christ (cf. 1:18ff) ("Christ Did Not Send Me To Baptise but to Evangelize," in Lorenzo De Lorenzi (ed), *Paul de Tarse: Apôtre du Notre Temps*, Série monographique de "Benedictina," Section paulinienne 1 [Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul, 1979], 353, 356). For Pesce, the two infinitives in 1:17a represent "two definite activities which are distinct from each other" (347-8) "Evangelizing" is the first Christian, missionary activity both in logical and chronological order while "baptizing" is the means by which the church incorporates the new believers in Christ in its shared lifeworld (362). However as Gerhard Friedrich rightly notes, *εὐαγγελίζομαι* can be used not only as a missionary term (cf. 1 Cor 9:16) but is a message that is addressed to Christians as well (Rom 1:11, 15; 1 Cor 9:12-18; Gal 4:13): "The same Gospel is proclaimed in both missionary and congregational preaching. Paul makes no distinction. God Himself speaks in preaching and He does not speak to Christians or to heathen, but to man as such, revealing Himself to him in grace and judgment through the Word." (*TDNT* 2:720) Indeed, as he writes in 1 Cor 1:17a, *εὐαγγελίζομαι* can be used to describe Paul's entire mission as an apostle. So, too, G. Strecker, who writes: "One cannot distinguish between missionary preaching and preaching addressed to the Church (cf. Rom 1:15 with 15:20; Gal 1:16, 23)" (G. Strecker, "*εὐαγγελίζω*" in *EDNT*, 69-74).

baptisms as performed ‘in the name of Paul’, that is, performed for the patronage and benefaction of mere men. Such a challenge in fact empties the cross of its power, compromises Paul’s apostolic call, and undermines the very pneumatic source the Corinthians depend on for their sense of exalted status. Paul is therefore thankful that he participated in none of their baptisms, having to qualify his absolute negative with the exception of Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas’ household, for Christ did not send him to baptise the Graeco-Roman social order but rather to proclaim the overturning of that order by the proclamation of the power of the cross. It is in light of these two contrasting baptisms – baptism ‘in the name of Christ’ (1:13c) and baptism ‘in the name of Paul’ (1:15) – that the baptism-gospel contrast in 1:17a is to be read. Paul is not contrasting baptism and the gospel *per se*; rather, he is contrasting baptism *with* and baptism *without* the gospel, the former representing the identifying characteristic of Christian ritual and social life.

Thus, we concluded that 1 Cor 1:10-17 represents an explicit example in Paul’s writings that post-baptismal social and ethical behaviour has the potential of affecting the apocalyptic integrity of the Christian baptism ritual. Paul’s understanding of the obligation to social mutuality manifesting the ethic of the cross appears rooted in the idea that without a distinct social life, one by which the Corinthians are set apart from the values constituting the Graeco-Roman world, Christian rituals lose their distinctiveness and hence their revelatory significance. The only way to maintain the apocalyptic integrity of baptisms ‘in the name of Christ’ is the formation and maintenance of an analogous apocalyptic social order on the part of the ritual participants. Otherwise, baptism ‘in the name of Christ’ is relegated to just another ritual that promotes and maintains the Graeco-Roman social order and is thus nothing more than baptism in the name of mere men.

Baptism, Ethics and the Eschatological Body: 1 Corinthians 6:11

4.1. Introduction

In 1 Cor 6:9-11, the reciprocal relationship between ritual and social order we found operative in 1:10-17 is further extended into eschatological, ethical and somatic dimensions. Paul's address to the 'saints' (οἱ ἅγιοι) at Corinth has now turned into a deliberate attempt to 'shame' (ἐντροπή) them as regards their actions toward one another (6:5). In addition to their ignoring or tolerating a case of incestuous relationship in their midst (5:1-13), one of the Corinthians has hauled another 'brother' (ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ) to courts overseen by unbelieving judges (6:6).³⁴⁵ For Paul, such actions are nothing less than a complete contradiction of the eschatological life to which they have been called, where as inheritors of the kingdom of God they will judge the cosmos and angels (6:2-3, 9-10).³⁴⁶ Indeed, actions such as this belong among a list of vices that constitute the 'unjust' (ἄδικοι), a polluted world that will not inherit the kingdom of God (6:9-10). However, the Corinthians are no longer part of this world. There was a time when they were identified with this fallen cosmos, but something has in fact intervened:

καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε: ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (6:11).

This passage has intrigued interpreters from basically two broad vantage points. First, since Bultmann, 1 Cor 6:9-11 has been at the forefront of the intense discussion surrounding Paul's indicative-imperative ethical formulation. This discussion involves the relationship between the eschatological and ethical frames of reference in the passage as well as the question regarding the forensic versus participationist significance of the verbs ἀγιάζω and δικαιόω. Secondly, there has been interest in Paul's conception of the Spirit (πνεῦμα) as it relates to the body, specifically, the bodies of the Corinthians and the body of Christ in 6:12-20. Scholars however have yet to recognise how these two broad

³⁴⁵ The legal battles may be an extension of the partisan battles referenced in 1:10-17, particularly if members of the church had to pick sides between the litigants (Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 117; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 97). On Graeco-Roman courts, see R.F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 226-7.

³⁴⁶ Conzelmann sees the eschatological or apocalyptic idea of the saints judging on the last day now reinterpreted by Paul as applicable in the present (*1 Corinthians*, 104).

inquiries in fact converge around the baptism ritual. I will argue that 1 Cor 6:9-11 corroborates that baptism was for Paul an apocalyptic ritual that revealed through the bodies of believers the dawning of the messianic age. In so doing, 1 Cor 6:9-11 exemplifies the role of the baptism ritual in establishing the distinctly Pauline indicative-imperative combination that has thus far been overlooked by scholars. The acceptance established unambiguously in the baptism ritual accounts for the status of ‘sanctification’ and ‘justification’ upon which the imperative of ethical obligation is based. I will further argue that as the revelation of the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the baptised establishes an unambiguous ethical obligation for its participants, those baptisms also entail the gift of God’s Spirit, the central characteristic of the messianic age, which enables the participants to fulfill those obligations. Moreover, because the Spirit is communicated through a ritually washed body, the body becomes the focal point for the Corinthians’ Christological and pneumatic identity.

4.2. Baptism in 1 Cor 6:11

For interpreters, there are basically two characteristics that identify 6:11 as a reference to the baptism ritual: Paul’s use of the verb ἀπολούω and his reference to the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.³⁴⁷ However, Dunn has argued that Paul is not in fact talking about baptism at all but rather “the great spiritual transformation of conversion...”³⁴⁸ Fee, too, argues that Paul is not concerned with the Christian initiatory rite, “but with the spiritual transformation made possible through Christ and effected by the Spirit,” arguing that Paul’s references to baptism employ the preposition εἰς (cf. 1 Cor 1:13-15; Gal 3:27-28) whereas here Paul uses ἐν.³⁴⁹ However, as Thiselton has noted, εἰς and ἐν were quite interchangeable in first-century Greek.³⁵⁰ And Paul does in fact use ἐν in the baptismal context of Gal 3:27-28 (ὁμεῖς εἰς ἔστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; cf. 1 Cor 12:13).³⁵¹ Furthermore, in its most basic sense, λούειν and its compound ἀπολούειν refer

³⁴⁷ Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:427-8; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 141; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 215-17; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 237. On the baptismal referent in 6:11, Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 163, writes: “The coincidence of language between ‘you had yourselves washed ... in the name of the Lord Jesus’ and that used by Ananias to Paul, ‘Get baptised and wash away your sins, calling on his name’ (Acts 22:16) is so close as to make it difficult to dissociate the ‘washing’ of 1 Cor 6:11 from the baptismal cleansing.”

³⁴⁸ *Baptism*, 121.

³⁴⁹ *First Epistle*, 246-7.

³⁵⁰ *First Epistle*, 138.

³⁵¹ Chester, *Conversion*, 134 n.77.

to the washing of the body (Acts 9:37; 16:33; 22:16), especially in relation to words like ἀγνίζειν and καθαίρειν.³⁵² In the LXX, λούειν generally connotes the washing of the body for both hygienic and ritual purposes, and rarely if ever is used as a metaphor.³⁵³ As such, 6:11 involves really Paul's only reference to the baptism ritual as a 'washing of the body'.³⁵⁴

As regards the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, scholars have probed 6:9-11 as comprising in part or whole a pre-Pauline tradition formula.³⁵⁵ In his *Theology*, Bultmann consigned 1 Cor 6:11 to a chapter entitled "The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church Aside from Paul," and in so doing distanced Paul's reference to justification in 6:11 from Paul's wider theology. Bultmann writes: "All three verbs describe the sacramental bath of purification; and in this series 'made righteous' is not meant in the specific sense of Paul's doctrine of justification, but, corresponding to 'made holy', is meant in the general-Christian sense: cancellation of sin."³⁵⁶ However, Chester has argued convincingly that apart from the reference to the 'name of Christ' there is little in this pericope that evidences traditional material. While the appeal to the baptismal formula ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 11 certainly precedes and transcends Paul, there is little evidence that the terminological network of associations preceding the baptismal formula – ἀπολούω, ἀγιάζω, δικαιόω – also involve a similar formulaic significance.³⁵⁷

4.3. The Ritual Formation of Pauline Ethics

³⁵² Cf. Ysebaert, *Greek*, 12: "From Homer onwards λούειν is the normal term for 'to wash, to bathe'..." See, too, Oepke, "λούω," *TDNT* 4:295.

³⁵³ Contra Fee, who argues that if baptism was Paul's concern, then he would have said, 'you were baptised' (*First Epistle*, 246). Fee does not address how ἀπολούειν is used in Jewish or Graeco-Roman literature.

³⁵⁴ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 107 n.42, sees in 1 Cor 6:11 an interpretation of baptism as a 'purification' ritual, as per 1QS^b IV, 22. Most scholars argue that the middle ἀπελούσασθε should not be rendered as a reflexive middle, 'you have washed yourselves' (e.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 136; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:427; Hartman, *Into the Name*, 63; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 163). Ysebaert, *Greek*, 63, argues that it is a middle that functions as a passive, pointing out that the passive form is rarely used and that the precedent for a technical use of the term among Christians had already been established.

³⁵⁵ Hartman, *Into the Name*, 63 n.28, 84; Meeks, *First Urban*, 119; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:427.

³⁵⁶ Bultmann, *Theology*, 136, cf. 72, 85. Cf. E.P. Sanders: "The point of all the verbs here, including 'justified', is that the Christians were *cleansed* of all the sins just enumerated" (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977], 471).

³⁵⁷ Chester, *Conversion*, 130-4.

Since the 1924 essay by Bultmann, “Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus,” the so-called ‘indicative-imperative combination’ has become the “basic formula” for Pauline ethics.³⁵⁸ For Bultmann, 1 Cor 6:9-11 was one of those passages in the Pauline corpus that appeared self-contradictory: “Next to statements according to which the justified person is free from sin, no longer in the flesh but living in the Spirit, and has died to sin, are those statements which admonish the justified person to fight against sin.”³⁵⁹ Bultmann recognised that this ‘already-not yet’ framework had a parallel in Paul’s conception of time, where *future* behaviour is based on *present* status.³⁶⁰ While Bultmann’s own solution to this paradox, that Paul’s imperatives were but expressions of faith derivative of the indicatives, has hardly been received without controversy, his argument that Pauline ethics played a central role in his theology nevertheless set the stage successfully for subsequent inquiry into Pauline ethics.³⁶¹ However, a recent volume of essays has challenged this indicative-imperative structure as an inadequate abstraction of Pauline ethics which, *inter alia*, arbitrarily separates the indicative and imperative into two unrelated categories.³⁶² Nevertheless, a key point of agreement among the various proposals is the foundational contribution of baptism to Pauline ethics, as indicated by the observation of Udo Schnelle: “Die in der Taufe vollzogene Beziehung zwischen dem Getauften und Christus ist die Grundlage aller ethischen Aussagen des Apostels.”³⁶³ In

³⁵⁸ William D. Dennison, “Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 14/1 (1979): 59. Furnish argues that relating Paul’s ‘theological’ proclamations with his ‘moral exhortations’ is “the crucial problem in interpreting the Pauline ethic.” See Victor Paul Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 9.

³⁵⁹ Bultmann, “Problem of Ethics,” 195.

³⁶⁰ Cf. Bultmann’s discussion of the indicative-imperative relationship in his chapter on ‘Faith as Eschatological Existence’, *Theology*, 75ff. So, too, Garland, who observes that Paul’s use of the indicative and imperative earlier in 5:7, ‘You are . . . , now be’, is here in 6:11 presented in terms of time: ‘You once were . . . , but now are’ (*1 Corinthians*, 215). Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 107, writes: “When the sacramental ground of the exhortation is here set alongside the eschatological one, then the presupposition is again the relationship between indicative and imperative, holiness and active sanctification (cf. 1 Thess 4:1ff)”; cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 245; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 142; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 235.

³⁶¹ See, e.g., Victor P. Furnish, “Belonging to Christ: A Paradigm for Ethics in First Corinthians,” *Interpretation* 44/2 (1990): 145-57; Michael Parsons, “Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul’s Writing,” in Rosner (ed.), *Understanding*, 217-250; Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “Paraenesis in Pauline Scholarship and in Paul – An Intricate Relationship,” in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen (eds.), (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH and Co., 2004), 267-98.

³⁶² F.W. Horn and R. Zimmermann (eds.), *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ: Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik* (WUNT 238; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

³⁶³ Udo Schnelle, “Paulus und Epiktet – zwei ethische Modelle,” in Horn and Zimmermann, *Jenseits*, 142; cf. Christof Landmesser, “Begründungsstrukturen paulinischer Ethik,” in Horn and Zimmermann, *Jenseits*, 187: “Die im Christusgeschehen verankerte und mit der Taufe symbolisierte enge Gemeinschaft mit Christus bestimmt immer wieder auch die ethisch relevanten Passagen der Paulusbriefe.”

what follows, we shall retain the indicative-imperative terminology for the sake of clarity, while acknowledging recent criticisms that the indicative and imperative are not separate or unrelated categories in Pauline thought, but are in fact inextricably intertwined.³⁶⁴ Indeed, it will be argued that both *temporal* and *moral* dimensions are intrinsic to ritualised processes, and thus a ritual reading of Paul is able to make a distinct contribution to Pauline eschatological ethics.

In what follows, I shall present a ritual theory that accounts for how time and ethics are complementary constituents of ritualised activity. I shall then argue that 1 Cor 6:9-11 demonstrates how baptism was formative for Paul's indicative-imperative combination in specifically three interrelated ways: i) baptism identified the baptised with interrelated temporal and ethical identity; ii) baptism conferred the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit by which ritually-established obligations might be fulfilled; iii) and baptism centered Christological and pneumatic identity on the ritualised body.

4.3.1. Ritual, Acceptance and the Establishment of Ethical Obligation

In ritual, there is an important connection between time and ethics. In our analysis of baptism in Galatians, we noted how ritualisation interrupts what Rappaport terms analogic time (continuous infinitesimal gradations of time) with digital time (discontinuous leaps of time). Performative statements such as “I will” in a marriage ceremony are instances in which continuous phenomena of change and maturation are represented digitally and thus definitely. Rites of passage overcome the considerable vagueness and ambiguity surrounding individual maturation by digitally transferring individuals from one category to another through the certainty of ritual demarcation. That a person has undergone a rite of passage – baptism in the case of Christian identity – signals unambiguously to the community that a person has not only reached a point at which s/he is prepared to leave the status of catechumen and assume that of Christian, but that s/he has in fact done so. The complex of unobservable and fluctuating processes of coming to belief in Christ is reduced by baptism to a single highly visible symbol of transfer.

³⁶⁴ So, too, Landmesser, “Begründungsstrukturen,” 178, 186.

However, this ritualised experience of time distinction entails as well an ethical component. For Rappaport, the structure of ritual is “circular,” in that the authority inherent in ritual and its generative oratory is ultimately contingent upon its acceptance by those presumably subject to it. As we saw above in our analysis of 1 Cor 1:10-17, the sanctity, the legitimacy or naturalness, that flows from what Rappaport terms ‘ultimate sacred postulates’, the unquestioned propositional authority that is embodied in liturgical orders, is contingent upon the acceptance of the congregation that liturgically embodies the sacred postulates of which sanctity is an entailment.³⁶⁵ Thus, the plausibility of the factivity or state of affairs generated by ritualised discourse is directly proportionate to the fidelity invested by the performers in the ritual institution of which they are participants.

It is in the performance of ritual that the fundamental office of ritual is actualised: *acceptance*.³⁶⁶ Because the participant *performs* the messages encoded in the ritual, s/he in fact embodies the encoded order, being infused with the sacred messages s/he both receives and transmits. To perform ritual is necessarily to embody and thus participate in the meaning communicated by its symbols, demonstrating personal acceptance of the ritual’s messages. Rappaport notes that any rejection by the performer of the very messages that they are communicating through their bodies is self-contradictory and therefore impossible.³⁶⁷ Performing a ritual establishes acceptance on the part of the ritual participants, an acceptance which is indicated unambiguously to both themselves and others. However, acceptance does not entail fidelity on the part of the performer to the ritual order s/he embodies. There is no guarantee that the marriage vows taken will be honored by the newlywed. The primary function of ritual performance is not to control behaviour, “but rather to establish conventional understandings, rules and norms in accordance with which everyday behaviour is *supposed* to proceed.... *Whether or not he abides by that rule, he has obligated himself to do so.*”³⁶⁸ If he does not, he has violated an obligation that he himself has avowed. The formal and public nature of ritual participation makes it clear that an act of acceptance is taking place, and that the performer has obliged herself to fidelity toward that obligation. Thus, ritualised events

³⁶⁵ *Ritual*, 278.

³⁶⁶ *Ritual*, 119.

³⁶⁷ *Ritual*, 119.

³⁶⁸ *Ritual*, 123, emphasis original.

provide the criteria by which behaviour may be morally judged, or said in another way, they performatively establish an ‘ought’ against which the ‘is’ of present behaviour may be judged.³⁶⁹

4.3.2. Baptism, Time and Ethics

In our examination of Galatians, we found that baptism revealed the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the Galatians. Here, in 1 Cor 6:11, Paul situates similarly the verb ἀπολούω in a distinctly eschatological context. Paul’s stated concern over a Corinthian Christian taking another ‘brother’ to court is that it contradicts their identity as heirs to the future establishment of the kingdom of God (6:9-10). In anticipation of this, Paul asks in v. 2: ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν; and in v. 3: οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινόμεν;. Paul’s two-fold rhetorical inquiry ‘Do you not know?’ (cf. v. 9) underscores what should be obvious to the Corinthians: the status of their lives has indeed changed radically as the result of the Christ-event: the Corinthians are even now participating in the eschatological hope of God’s holy people to inherit the earth in righteousness (cf. Wis 3:7-8; Sir 4:11, 15; *Jub* 24:29; *I Enoch* 1:9; 38:1, 5; 95:3; 96:1; 98:12; 108:12; 1QH 4:26-27; 1QpHab 5:4-5).³⁷⁰ They are *now* saints (οἱ ἅγιοι; 6:1-2; cf. 1:2) who have been ‘sanctified’ or ‘made holy’ (ἀγιάζω; 6:11) and are thus called to live in the present in a manner that anticipates their lives in the kingdom of God.³⁷¹

In contrast to life in God’s realm, Paul invokes a vice-list that constitutes the realm of what he terms the οἱ ἄδικοι in vv. 9-10. As Chester notes: “The vice-list of 6:9-10 is not, strictly speaking, a catalogue of sins, but of types of sinner. Paul speaks not of those who commit sexual immorality, but of the sexually immoral and so on.”³⁷² The purpose of the vice-list is to get the Corinthians to see that their taking each other to court is as sinful as sexual immorality and idolatry (πορνεία, εἰδωλολατρεία). “Just as Paul expects their conversion to have redefined previously acceptable religious and sexual practices as

³⁶⁹ *Ritual*, 133.

³⁷⁰ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 231.

³⁷¹ Chester, *Conversion*, 137 n.87, writes: “Thus, present conduct is to be determined by eschatological roles.”

³⁷² Chester, *Conversion*, 134.

unrighteous and sinful, so he now expects his argument to produce a similar redefinition with regard to their litigious quarrels.”³⁷³

In v. 11, Paul makes absolutely clear that such a world no longer defines the Corinthians (καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε ἀλλὰ...).³⁷⁴ The reason why they are no longer defined by such characteristics is because the Corinthians ‘were washed, sanctified, and justified’. The Corinthians’ bodies are now ‘members of Christ’ (τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν, 6:15); they are now a ‘temple of the Holy Spirit’ (τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν, 6:19), the Spirit whom they now have from God, and are thus not their own (οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν, 6:19). As such, 6:11 builds upon Paul’s overall apocalyptic historical schema in Corinthians. Paul speaks of his gospel as “secret and hidden” wisdom “which God decreed from before the ages” (2:7) and which he has now revealed (ἀποκαλύπτω, 2:10) to believers. As a result of the revelation of Christ, history is now divided into two ages, which means that Paul is participating with those “upon whom the end of the ages has come” (10:11; cf. 4:20; 15:50). This temporal duality is comprised of social and ethical dualities constituted by the ‘saved’ and ‘perishing’ (1:18-21), ‘believers’ and ‘unbelievers’ (14:22-25), ‘saints’ and ‘unrighteous’ (6:1-2).³⁷⁵ It is thus “within the church, gathered as the body of Christ and as the temple of the Holy Spirit (3:16; 6:19; 12:12-18, 27), that the presence of God in Christ (1 Cor 14:25f; 2 Cor 2:10) is now being revealed and encountered, while outside of the community of the Spirit the reign of Satan still prevails (1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 2:11).”³⁷⁶

In sum, there is a clear temporal emphasis in the structure of Paul’s argument in 6:1-11 that parallels the temporal significance of Paul’s baptismal allusion in Gal 3:26-29. The fact that the Corinthians will one day judge the world and angels (6:2-3) in the *future* is the result of their *present* identity, having passed from an ‘unrighteous’ (ἄδικος) cosmos characteristic of sins that in the *past* identified some of the Corinthians (1 Cor 6:9-10). This passage into a ‘righteous’ (δίκαιος) cosmos took place *when* they were ‘washed’ (cf. the aorist ἀπελούσασθε; 1 Cor 6:11). 1 Cor 6:9-11 is thus further evidence that baptism is interpreted by Paul as an apocalyptic ritual that declared the dawning of

³⁷³ Chester, *Conversion*, 137.

³⁷⁴ The initial ἀλλὰ has a sense of ‘on the contrary’ (BDF 448.2; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 236)

³⁷⁵ Adams, *Constructing*, 107.

³⁷⁶ Scott Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), 426.

the messianic age: the washing served as a ritualised act demarcating that point in time when ‘our Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of our God’ had in fact been initially and decisively experienced by the Corinthians, removing them from a temporally demarcated state of vice into one of righteousness.

4.3.3. Baptism and the Indicative-Imperative Ethic

As the previous observation suggests, this temporal demarcation between what the Corinthians once were and who they are now is linked inextricably to their ethical identity. Rappaport’s ritual theory provides a highly illuminating rationale for Paul’s understanding of how the Corinthians’ obligations are in fact inextricably interwoven with their ritually established ethical and eschatological status.

First, we can see a clear unambiguous line drawn by Paul between the world and the Corinthians through 6:1-11. What would be an important part of the conversion process for the Corinthians is that the uncertainties inherent in coming to faith in Christ, such as the more-or-less instances of unbeliever and/or believer, the world and/or the *ekklesia*, insider and/or outsider, polytheist and/or monotheist, catechumen and/or Christian, would have been overcome by the way in which their ritualised washings imposed a sharp unambiguous qualitative distinction upon their bodies, such as belief/ unbelief, *ekklesia*/ the world, new age/ old age, way of life/ way of death, called/ not-called, adopted/ estranged; etc.³⁷⁷ These sharp unambiguous qualitative distinctions are inherent particularly in the *non-recurrence* characteristic of initiation rites, imposing an unambiguous either/or alternative to the initiate: either s/he participated in the initiation rite, or s/he didn’t. The person was either baptised or s/he was not.

Clear unambiguous binaries such as these are evident in our text. Note that Paul uses the phrase οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι several times in the span of these verses (6:2, 3, 9, 19), making it clear to the Corinthians that they should not be confused about these things in the least. If the Corinthians are currently judges by virtue of their eschatological destiny, how can they possibly defer to unbelieving judges to decide matters between them (6:1-6)? Paul underscores this point in vv. 9-10 by arguing that the Corinthians’ eschatological destiny is the opposite of that of unbelievers who will not inherit the kingdom of God. And while

³⁷⁷ Cf. Rappaport, *Ritual*, 91.

Paul makes clear that some of the Corinthians were once identified as these kinds of unbelievers, that former life has now been transformed by virtue of their washing in v. 11. Paul follows this ritualised line of demarcation between unjust and the just with what most commentators see as a quotation of a position held by some of the Corinthians: “All things are lawful for me,” and “food is for the belly and the belly for food” in vv. 12-13,³⁷⁸ which he then contrasts (δὲ) with his own position, that the ‘body is not for πορνεία but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body, and God both raised the Lord and will raise us through his power’ (6:13b-14). This binary between porneia on the one side and God, Christ, and believers on the other, means that the prostitute in vv. 15-16 is “not a person in her own right ... but a representative of the cosmos that is estranged and opposed to God and Christ. As in 1 Corinthians 1-4, Paul’s argument depends on the radical separation of Christ’s body from the cosmos, in an apocalyptic, ethical dualism.”³⁷⁹

Secondly, note how the establishment of acceptance entailed in their washings fits with the Corinthian context. The *act* of behaving immorally, such as taking a brother to court, does not nullify the *fact* that the Corinthians do indeed have a new moral identity in Christ. Thus, whether or not the Corinthians abide by the eschatological messages that flowed through their ritualised bodies, they have nevertheless obligated themselves to do so. If they do not, they have violated an obligation that they themselves have avowed. For Paul, ritualised washings in the name of Christ provide the criteria by which behaviour may be morally judged.

Thirdly, the ritualised nature of acceptance can explain the nature of the other two verbs in v. 11, ἀγιάζω and δικαιόω. We should first note that Paul’s use of the triple ἀλλά preceding each verb means that, contra Bultmann, they are not synonymous, but stand both individually as well as collectively in opposition to what has gone before.³⁸⁰ Said differently, each verb belongs to the constituents of the reality into which the Corinthians have been incorporated through the Christ-event. Furthermore, I find little justification within the passage to segregate the terms such that they represent an *ordo salutis* of sorts, three separate phases constituted first by washing, followed by sanctification, followed

³⁷⁸ On the interpretive complexities of 6:12-13, see Karl Sandnes, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* (SNTSMS 120; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 191-99.

³⁷⁹ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 176. Cf. Levison, *Filled*, 300: “There are, after all, two spheres represented here, one filled with the spirit of the world and the other with the spirit from God.”

³⁸⁰ Chester, *Conversion*, 139.

by justification.³⁸¹ This supposed *ordo* would be seemingly contradicted by the reversal of such an order in 1 Cor 1:30. Commentators are almost unanimous that the three terms stand both distinct and interdependent.³⁸²

Now, in discerning the relationship between ἀπολούω and ἀγιάζω, it is important to note that the processes of ritualisation constitute various strategies and mechanisms by which acts and utterances, beliefs and behaviours, are quite literally made sacred, sanctified, set apart to a privileged status from all other alternative acts and utterances characteristic of mundane life (cf. the petition ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου in Mt 6:9; Lk 11:2). Hence, by communicating the dawning of the messianic age and their acceptance of such through their ritual washings, the Corinthians are in fact set apart, sharing in and fused with the sanctity of the ritually communicated messages. This *status* indicator communicated through the bodies of the participants overlaps with Paul's use of ἀγιάζω elsewhere to denote the community as a sphere of purity in which God's presence dwells 'in Christ' and into which they were incorporated through their ritual washings (cf. 1:2, 10-17).³⁸³ That ἀγιάζω is relational or positional rather than ontological is clear from 7:14, where an unbelieving spouse of a believer is described as 'holy' (ἀγιάζω) by virtue of his or her relationship to the believing spouse.³⁸⁴ The important contribution that 6:11 makes is that here Paul considers ἀγιάζω as a state acquired through the baptism ritual. Said differently, their sanctification 'in Christ' (1:2) is effected by their washings 'in the name of Christ'. Further, as we shall see below, this sanctification is effected precisely because their washed bodies, as ritualised revelations of the dawning of the messianic age, transmit the central promise of that age: the advent of the 'Spirit of our God' (6:11).

Turning to δικαίω, there is now broad agreement that the New Testament use of δικαίω has a declarative or forensic, rather than causative, meaning (e.g. to declare

³⁸¹ Fee, *First Epistle*, 246; Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 98, denies that the three verbs can be read as a spiritual *ordo*, but rather "are three descriptions of the one fundamental transformation that has occurred for those who now belong to Christ." Contra Witherington, *Troubled Waters*, 90, who interprets the passage as an *ordo*.

³⁸² "The three aorists are to be regarded as denoting coincidental action and all three are qualified by 'in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God'" (Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 164).

³⁸³ Hays sees the Corinthians' baptisms as a "sign of their transference into the sphere of Christ's lordship" (*First Corinthians*, 97).

³⁸⁴ Chester, *Conversion*, 141.

someone righteous, vindicated or acquitted),³⁸⁵ the significance of which is picked up from the use of δικαιόω in the LXX influenced by the Hebrew (rather than a Hellenic) semantic background.³⁸⁶ This forensic meaning is all the more pronounced against the backdrop of Paul's law court references in 6:1-7 (κρίνω, κριτήριο, κρίμα).³⁸⁷ Paul's association between their 'justification' and their future 'judgment' of the world and angels means that they have been delivered from this 'unrighteous' age (cf. ἄδικος) where Satan reigns (5:5) and constituted by those who will not inherit (κληρονομέω) the kingdom of God (6:9-10). Instead, the Corinthians stand in the presence of God as 'righteous' or 'acquitted' (δικαιόω, 6:11). These forensic motifs amplify the declarative significance of Paul's phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which, while identified with their washings (cf. 1:13c, 15) is equally identified with their justification in v. 11. Thus, the baptismal context of their justification corroborates Thiselton's description of δικαιόω in the LXX as "*an illocutionary speech-act of declaration and verdict, operating with the widespread logic in religious language of pronouncing, deeming, seeing as, authorizing, declaring, evaluating.*"³⁸⁸ Though obedience will be a key aspect of Paul's argument (6:12-20), this declaration is solely identified with the grace of God revealed in Christ the reality of which, like their washing and sanctification, is not dependent on their obedience or fulfillment of their ritually established obligations.

In sum, ritual logic provides the rationale for Paul's indicative-imperative combination in vv. 9-11: the *status* of the Corinthians in relation to Christ and the

³⁸⁵ See, e.g., Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 141-77; K.L. Onesti and M.T. Brauch, "Righteousness, Righteousness of God," in Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 843; P.T. O'Brien, "Justification in Paul and Some Crucial Issues of the Last Two Decades," in D.A. Carson (ed.), *Right With God: Justification in the Bible and the World* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 69-95; D.A. Carson, "Reflections on Salvation and Justification in the New Testament," *JETS* 40.4 (1997) 581-608, 594; Charles H. Cosgrove, "Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection," *JBL* 106 (1987): 653-70; Hafemann, "Paul and his Interpreters," in Hawthorne and Martin, *Dictionary*, 666-79; Richard B. Hays, "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3," *JBL* 99/1, (1980): 107-115; Klaas Runia, "Justification and Roman Catholicism," in Carson, *Right With God*, 197-215; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 68-93.

³⁸⁶ For the common meaning of the Hebrew צדק as "to declare to be in the right" see Carson, "Reflections," 589. For the development of δικαιοσύνη and its cognates in terms of its forensic significance derived from צדק, see David Hill, *Greek Words with Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (SNTSMS 5; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967), 82-162. Cf. G. Schrenk, "δικαιόω κτλ.," *TDNT* 2:211-219; Esler, *Galatians*, 160-9.

³⁸⁷ Cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 225, who notes that judgment motifs abound in this passage.

³⁸⁸ *First Epistle*, 455-6, emphasis original.

kingdom of God, namely, their ‘sanctification’ and ‘justification’, was established ritually through the act of acceptance inherent in their participation in the ritual washing. Their acceptance of the Lordship of Christ and the dawning of the messianic age in turn established an obligation to live a life concomitant with the ethical and social order constitutive of the kingdom of God in Christ. Such an obligation set the Corinthians apart as God’s *ekklesia*, sanctified in Christ (cf. 1:2), and acquitted by God to judge the world in righteousness. Because this status was established ritually, it is not itself constituted by or even dependent on their *conformity* to or *fulfillment* of the obligations inherent in that status, but rather provides the unambiguous indicative upon which Paul may base his imperative that is itself intrinsic to the acceptance demonstrated in the baptism ritual.

4.3.4. Baptism, Ethics and the Spirit

However, Paul is not intent on pointing out solely that the Corinthians have obligated themselves to live a life indicative of the kingdom of God in Christ. There is still another factor in 6:11 that accounts for the indicative-imperative ethic in an eschatological context. The Corinthians were washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of Christ and ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Commentators have largely overlooked the significance of the Spirit for Paul’s argument in 1 Corinthians 6:9-11, but, as we shall see, the Spirit is hardly peripheral to Paul’s concerns. Indeed, I will argue that the reference to the Spirit is an essential component to Paul’s ritually established indicative-imperative ethic.

By this point in his epistle, Paul has established the presence of the Spirit in the midst of the *ekklesia* as that reality which now defines the Corinthians (1 Cor 2:10-14; 3:16; 6:11; 12:3, 7-13; 2 Cor 3:8). In so doing, Paul situates himself within the trajectory of a Jewish tapestry of prophetic-eschatological texts that associated the age to come with an outpouring of God’s Spirit (e.g. Joel 2:28-32; Isa 32:15-17; 44:3-5; *T. Levi* 18:7, 9; *T. Judah* 24:1-3; etc.).³⁸⁹ In accordance with this tradition, Paul uses the term τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ in 6:11 (cf. 1 Cor 2:11, 14; 3:16; 7:40; Rom 8:9, 11, 14) which mirrors the LXX phrase πνεῦμα θεοῦ which denotes the very presence of God itself (cf. Gen 1:2; 41:38; Num 23:7; Jdg 6:34; 1 Sam 10:10; 19:9, 20, 23; Isa 11:2; etc.).³⁹⁰ As Paul argued earlier in

³⁸⁹ Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul’s Letters and Thought*, Society for New Testament Monograph Series 119 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 114.

³⁹⁰ Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 212ff.

the epistle, it is the proclamation of the gospel of Christ that reveals the presence of the Spirit (2:4-16). It is thus the Spirit that leads and incorporates one into Christ (cf. 12:12-13) such that one cannot proclaim the Lordship of Christ apart from the Spirit (12:3). The fact that the Spirit dwells in their midst is what constitutes the Corinthians as the ‘temple of God’ (6:19; cf. 1 Cor 3:16; 11:27-32; cf. 2 Cor 5:10; 13:2-5), a fact that they should have known (οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι). According to S. Hafemann: “Paul is therefore convinced that those who have been justified and set apart in the name of Christ and are living *in the Spirit* are *already* participating in the present reality of the kingdom of God, while the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom when it is established in all its fullness (1 Cor 6:7-11; cf. Gal 1:4 with Gal 5:21).”³⁹¹

However, Paul’s understanding of the significance of the presence of the Spirit for the lives of the Corinthians appears at odds with their own understanding. For Paul, the power and presence of the Spirit in the lives of believers is not manifested in exalted status or ecstatic utterance, but rather in their moral transformation. Thus, against the backdrop of the vice-list in 6:9-10, Paul can say pointedly that it is the spiritual and ethical conversion of the Corinthians that constitutes the sanctifying and justifying experience of the Spirit in Christ (cf. 1 Cor 1:30; 3:1-3, 17; 5:4f; 10:11).³⁹² Because ethical and spiritual transformation is the goal of the gifts of the Spirit themselves (cf. 1 Cor 12:3, 7; 13:1-13; 14:3, 12), it is Paul’s belief “that those who possess the Spirit of God ... will grow in faith from being ‘babes in Christ’ to becoming ‘spiritual people’ (πνευματικοί; 1 Cor 3:1; cf. 6:20; 9:24; 10:7-10, 14; 15:58; [etc.]).”³⁹³ And because their ‘righteousness, sanctification, and redemption’ come from Christ (1:20), the Corinthians are not to boast in themselves but in the Lord (1:31), and thus live a life of thanksgiving in response to God’s grace (3:21; 10:31) which keeps his commandments and glorifies God in their bodies (6:20).³⁹⁴

Given Paul’s pneumatology in 1 Corinthians, we can see the role of the Spirit in the ritual formation of Paul’s indicative-imperative ethic. While the washing ritual

³⁹¹ Scott J. Hafemann, “The ‘Temple of the Spirit’ as the Inaugural Fulfillment of the New Covenant within the Corinthian Correspondence,” *Ex Auditu* 12 (1996): 29-42, 39.

³⁹² Cf. John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 294-300.

³⁹³ Hafemann, “The Temple,” 36.

³⁹⁴ Hafeman, *Paul*, 423.

constitutes both the indicative and the imperative, in that ritual *establishes* ethical obligation, it is Paul's reference to the 'Spirit of our God' in 6:11 that in fact provides for the *fulfillment* of the imperative. Paul's call for the Corinthians to live an apocalyptic life concomitant with their apocalyptic washings is based on the fact that those washings communicated or conferred upon the Corinthians the very pneumatic gift by which such an apocalyptic life might be lived-out.

4.3.5. Baptism and the Eschatological Body

The fact that this ethical obligation and its pneumatic means of fulfillment were established through the washing of the *body* accounts for Paul's subsequent discussion in 6:12-20. Scholars have recognised the significance of the Spirit and the human body in these verses, but there has been little reflection on that relationship as an extension of the Corinthians' ritual washing.³⁹⁵ In our analysis of baptism in Gal 3:26-29, we noted the importance of the body for the success of performatives. Performative acts and utterances are effective in establishing social states of affairs only to the extent that they are accepted by the ritual participants. This acceptance is demonstrated through bodily performance where the ritual participant embodies and thus becomes identified with the messages that are communicated through the ritual. We have further seen in our present pericope that such acceptance establishes social conventions that obligate the ritual participant to behave in a manner conducive to those conventions.

There is little question that Paul is very concerned about the body in the Corinthian community.³⁹⁶ Indeed, Paul references the term σῶμα no less than eight times in vv. 12-20 in the context of returning to the issue of sexual immorality and the desecration of the body (πορνεία referenced twice along with the related πορνή [twice] and πορνεύω [once]).³⁹⁷ What has escaped the gaze of the interpreter thus far, however, is the somatic relevance of Paul's choice of term ἀπολούω, a *hapax legomenon* in the Pauline corpus, for the baptism ritual. Scholars have noted that Paul's use of the verb ἀπολούω serves to

³⁹⁵ Cf. Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 174-6; Stowers, "Pauline Participation," 353ff; Levison, *Filled*, 294-300.

³⁹⁶ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 174, commenting on the various issues in 1 Corinthians 5-6: "What underlies and connects all these issues is Paul's anxiety about the boundaries of the body." Cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 239: "The heart of Paul's argument is ... the importance of the human body."

³⁹⁷ Fee, *First Epistle*, 250.

stress the cleansing of filth or the removal of dirt associated with their past sins (cf. Eph 5:26; Heb 10:22).³⁹⁸ However, we should not overlook the somatic nature of the term. As Oepke writes: “As distinct from πλύνειν for the washing of clothes and νίζειν or νίπτειν for washing the face, hands, or feet, λούειν is normally used for the complete cleansing of the body ... ἀπολούειν is used in the same sense, though often with a material obj. (λούειν ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα, “to wash away clotted blood,” Homer, *Il.* 14.7)...”³⁹⁹ In the LXX, λούειν (ἀπολούειν is limited to Job 9:30) means ‘to wash’ or ‘to bathe’ the body, particularly in relation to ritual purity (cf. Lev 11:40; 14:8; 15:5ff.; Deut 23:12; etc).⁴⁰⁰

In light of our ritual theory, Paul’s use of ἀπολούω would mean that the body is the location for the Corinthians’ Christological and pneumatic identity. Thus, the revelation of the dawning of the messianic age of the Spirit through their ritualised bodies extends out from the washed body into an ethical life which involves the purity of the body of the believer in relation to the glorified body of the resurrected Christ. As 1 Cor 6:14 notes, because believers share in the very Spirit that is characteristic of Christ’s resurrected body (cf. Rom 8:11), the Christian body itself is in a state of transition by which it too will be resurrected (cf. 1 Cor 15:46; Rom 6:5; 8:29; Phil 3:21). As such, the Corinthians are ‘temples of the Holy Spirit’ (6:19) and are thus to glorify God in their bodies (6:20), that is, live in the present in such a manner commensurate with the Christological identity of their future resurrected life (cf. 6:1-2) that has already begun by virtue of their communion with the Spirit, demonstrating themselves to be participating with those ‘upon whom the end of the ages has come’ (1 Cor 10:11; cf. 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4; Gal 1:4; 6:15). The three terms – ‘washed’, ‘sanctified’, ‘justified’ – thus work together to constitute a ritualised means of fostering pneumatically the body and ethical identity of the believer into a harmonic relationship with the macrocosmic glorified body of Christ. Paul’s exposition on the revelation of the love of God displayed through the kenotic love of Christ crucified in the first four chapters of the Corinthian correspondence provides the rationale for why the Corinthians should be willing to suffer wrongs and injustices (6:7)

³⁹⁸ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 215.

³⁹⁹ *TDNT*, “λούω,” 4:295. Oepke, too, notes that, given the Corinthians’ past social and ethical status, ἀπολούω has a clear allusion to pagan and Jewish lustrations (304).

⁴⁰⁰ Oepke, “λούω,” *TDNT*, 4:300.

rather than seek vindication in Graeco-Roman courts and thus dissipate the Christological and pneumatic boundary separating the Corinthian believers from the polluted cosmos (6:7-8). And as this boundary is effected through their pneumatic washings, incorporating them ritually into the glorified body of the resurrected Christ, sexual immorality has the effect of bleeding the perversions of their former polluted cosmos into this ‘sanctified’ sphere, causing Christ’s body through the Spirit to in effect participate in such sexually immoral acts (6:15) which risks both God’s judgment (3:17) and the dissolution of their Christ-centered identities that have been ‘bought with a price’ (6:20). To behave in a manner that violates this cosmic state and the obligations inherent therein is not only a denial of the Corinthians’ pneumatic identity in Christ, but indeed a betrayal of the very Spirit of God given to them in order to fulfill their baptismally-established obligations.

4.4. Summary and Conclusions

1 Cor 6:9-11 provides important frames of reference that expand our understanding of Paul’s interpretation of the ritual of baptism. We rehearsed the standard evidence that this passage is indeed dealing, at least in part, with the baptism rite. Of interest was Paul’s selection of the verb ἀπολούω, a cognate of λούω, which, particularly in the LXX, consistently refers to the washing of the human body, and rarely if ever is used as a metaphor. While the appeal to the baptismal formula ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 11 certainly precedes and transcends Paul, there is little evidence that the terminological network of associations preceding the baptismal formula – ἀπολούω, ἀγιάζω, δικαιώω – also involve a similar formulaic significance.

We initially found a highly temporal emphasis in the structure of Paul’s argument in 6:1-11 that paralleled the temporal significance of Paul’s baptismal allusion in Gal 3:26-29. We thus discovered further evidence that baptism is interpreted by Paul as an apocalyptic ritual such that the ritual washing served as a ritualised act demarcating that point in time when ‘our Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of our God’ had in fact been initially and decisively experienced by the Corinthians. We then examined the relevance of ritual in the establishment of ethical obligation, and found that Paul’s emphasis on ethical identity on the one hand and their washed bodies on the other converged in the processes specific to ritualisation, for ritual forges a distinct ethical identity through

bodily performance. Because the ritualised body transmits messages through its acts and utterances, that body is in fact identified or fused with those messages, such that for the persons to reject the messages communicated through their very bodies as they are transmitting them would be a contradiction and thus impossible. Therefore, by participating in bodily washings performed ‘in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ’, the Corinthians inexorably communicated that they accepted what they were communicating, that is, they conferred an agreement, assent and conformity to their somatically transmitted messages. We noted further that because ritual acceptance does not necessarily entail fidelity on the part of the ritual performers to the messages they embody, the Corinthians’ status and obligation to live their lives in accordance with the messianic age was not dependent on their fulfillment of those obligations. We therefore discovered a ritual logic to the indicative-imperative concerns of Paul in this passage: Paul is calling the Corinthians to realise in their behaviour the sanctified and righteous obligations that their washings in the name of Christ unambiguously established. For Paul, their sacred washings were thus absolutely efficacious in establishing a new ethical identity among the Corinthians that is itself not dependent for its validity on their subsequent behaviour.

We further found that this ritually established status was able to explain the interrelationship between ἀπολούω, ἀγιάζω and δικαιόω. The ritual washing by virtue of its obligatory mechanism ‘set apart’ the ritual participants from the profane cosmos on the one hand, while the performative nature of the ritual declared or pronounced justification on the participants on the other. Thus our reading provided a performative account for what scholars have seen as the distinctly declarative nature of δικαιόω.

We then accounted for Paul’s reference to the ‘Spirit of our God’ in light of this ritually-established ethical framework. While the baptism ritual for Paul established an ethical obligation concomitant with the dawning of the messianic age, it was the gift of the Spirit – the central characteristic of that age – that provided the fulfillment for such ethical obligations. Said differently, the Spirit was the apocalyptic fulfillment of the apocalyptic ethic that participation in an apocalyptic ritual requires. And we noted that Paul’s unique reference to the verb ἀπολούω denoted the washed body as the location for their Christological and pneumatic identity. The ritual washings, as they were

transformed by the invocation of Christ and the presence of the Spirit, had the effect of incorporating the bodies of the participants into the body of Christ as temples of the Holy Spirit (6:15, 19).

1 Cor 6:9-11 thus evidences that baptism for Paul was an apocalyptic ritual, revealing performatively the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of its participants, which obligated those participants to live a concomitantly apocalyptic life, an obligation that was fulfilled in their reliance on the gift of the Spirit, itself the central characteristic of the messianic age.

Baptism and the Spirit: 1 Corinthians 12:13

5.1. Introduction

As we approach 1 Cor 12:13, we see that Paul's exposition of the Spirit in 2:10-14, 3:16, and 6:11 has developed into the topic of spiritual gifts (πνευματικά, 12:1). Paul argues in 12:4-11 that though the gifts are variegated, they nevertheless flow out of the same Spirit, and thus the diversity of gifts provides a mosaic of a pneumatically unified community. This unity in diversity is grounded in a common rhetorical topos that exemplifies the unity and diversity of the social body with an appeal to the image of the physical body, from which Paul draws a parallel with the fact that the Corinthians all share a common baptism that brought them into one social body by the one Spirit:

καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

There are two main interrelated issues involved in interpreting 1 Cor 12:13.⁴⁰¹ The first involves determining the relationship between πνεῦμα and βαπτίζειν in 12:13a. The second issue involves determining the relationship between the two verbs βαπτίζειν in 12:13a and ποτίζειν in 12:13c. I will survey the various proposals for each issue and demonstrate the extent to which they fail to advance our overall understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and baptism in 12:13. I will then propose an alternative interpretation of the passage that satisfies these two strands of scholarship surrounding 12:13a and 12:13c. This proposal involves explaining the relationship between the Spirit and baptism while at the same time appropriating the relationship between βαπτίζειν and ποτίζειν within that resolution. I will propose understanding the relationship between Spirit and βαπτίζειν and ποτίζειν in light of the ritual logic provided by metaphoric

⁴⁰¹ The disputed issue over whether the preposition ἐν is to be translated locatively ('in') or instrumentally ('by', 'through') remains unresolved. I am inclined toward the instrumental sense for ἐν based on the (clearly instrumental) parallel usage of ἐν in 6:11 and 12:3, 9 together with the fact that a locative interpretation would involve a *double* locative with the phrase εἰς ἓν σῶμα. See, e.g., Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 167; Thomas R. Schreiner, "Baptism in the Epistles: An Initiation Rite for Believers," in *Believer's Baptism: Sign of the New Covenant in Christ*, ed. by Thomas R. Schreiner and Shawn D. Wright (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006), 71-2; M.B. O'Donnell, "Two Opposing Views of Baptism with/by the Holy Spirit and of 1 Corinthians 12:13: Can Grammatical Investigation Bring Clarity?" in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, The New Testament and the Church*, (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academica Press, 1999), 311-36; Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 175.

predication as developed by James Fernandez and Roy Rappaport, which enables us to see how Paul's understanding of baptism was shaped significantly by his apocalyptic conviction that the promise of the Spirit in Ezek 36:25-27 has in fact been fulfilled in Christ.

5.2. The Relationship Between πνεῦμα and βαπτίζειν

To date, there have been two major proposals for interpreting 1 Cor 12:13, what we might call *sacramental* interpretations and *symbolic* interpretations. I shall survey each in turn.

Sacramental interpretations. Recently labeled the *communis opinio* of critical scholarship,⁴⁰² the sacramental interpretation of 12:13 understands water-baptism as the means by which the Spirit is imparted to believers.⁴⁰³ The basic rationale for this association is as follows: i) There are clear verbal parallels between 1 Cor 12:13 and Gal 3:27-28 which are mutually interpretive, namely, the form-critical features examined in Gal 3:26-29 above (see 2.2). As Gal 3:27 shares the phrase εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε with Rom 6:3, it is clear that Gal 3:27 is a reference to the baptism ritual and, reciprocally, 1 Cor 12:13 is as well.⁴⁰⁴ ii) More generally, baptism was understood as a death to one's old life and the beginning of a new life, and was thus associated with the gift of the Spirit, the power of this new life (1 Cor 6:11; cf. Acts 2:38; cf. Jn 3:5; Acts 10:47; 19:2-6; *Barn* 11.11).⁴⁰⁵

Within this interpretive trajectory, a number of scholars have gone further than merely observing a ritual connection between baptism and the reception of the Spirit. They have sought to explain this connection between Spirit and water in terms of a

⁴⁰² Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (WUNT II/283. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 97.

⁴⁰³ On 1 Cor 12:13 and more broadly in Paul's theology, see, e.g., Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl*, 11-12; 14-16; Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, 225-6; idem, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (ET, William Montgomery. London: A&C Black, 1931), 18-23, 118-19, 260-3; U. Schnelle, *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: Vorpaulinische und nachpaulinische Tauftheologie*; GTA 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 124-26; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 212; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 289; W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1Kor 11,17-14,40)*; EKKNT VII/3 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger/Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 216; Chester, *Conversion*, 281; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 169, 273; Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 126; Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 62-3, 215; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 463. See further the sources listed in Cross, "Spirit- and Water-Baptism," 121-2 n.2.

⁴⁰⁴ E.g. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne," 165-208; Betz, *Galatians*, 181-5; MacDonald, *No Male and Female*, 4-9; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 169; Chester, *Conversion*, 282-3; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther 8-16* (THKNT; Berlin: Evangelische, 1982), 298 n.300.

⁴⁰⁵ Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 62; Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 288-9.

substantial union. T. Engberg-Pedersen draws from Graeco-Roman physics in interpreting 1 Cor 12:13 to conclude: “Baptism and pneuma hang intrinsically together and they generate the one physical body to which all baptised believers belong when in a wholly literal sense they are ‘in Christ’ ... It is all a question of elemental pneumatic cosmology.”⁴⁰⁶ Similarly, Strecker, commenting on Paul’s term σῶμα πνευματικόν in 1 Cor 15:44, argues that “heavenly body is a body of pneumatic substance, in contrast to the earthly body composed of sarx.”⁴⁰⁷ He then comments that the connection to baptism “presumably derives from the fact that the Spirit was combined with the water as a substantial unity,” citing the Didache 7:1-2 prescription to baptism in ‘living water’ (ζῶν ὕδωρ).⁴⁰⁸ Troy W. Martin turns to the Pneumatics of early Greek medical theory to illuminate how the Spirit enters the believer through baptism.

Paul’s association of the reception of the Spirit with water baptism in 1 Cor 12:13a implicates the pores of the moistened skin as ports of the Spirit’s entry into the human body. The author of *Nutriments* writes that moisture is the vehicle of nutriment and without moisture the body cannot assimilate nutriment. Thus, water baptism is necessary for receiving the nutriment of the Spirit.⁴⁰⁹

This latter development within the trajectory of what we have labeled *sacramental* interpretations has come under severe scrutiny recently by Volker Rabens. Rabens argues that Graeco-Roman physics was far more diverse than these scholars have assumed.⁴¹⁰ Further, even if such a supposition was granted, the central question remains whether the Stoic connected a material spirit and soul with ethics in a manner comparable to Paul.⁴¹¹ Rabens concludes that the conception of a material πνεῦμα ontologically transforming the human person into a new ethical identity is absent from both Graeco-Roman and Jewish literature, at least up to 100 CE.⁴¹² The diversity of Graeco-Roman physics and the lacuna

⁴⁰⁶ Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 69; cf. 53, 174.

⁴⁰⁷ Georg Strecker, *Theology of the New Testament* (ET by M. Eugene Boring; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), 162.

⁴⁰⁸ Strecker, *Theology*, 162 n.79.

⁴⁰⁹ Troy W. Martin, “Paul’s Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts,” in J. Fotopoulos (ed.), *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (SNT 122; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 105-26, 116-7.

⁴¹⁰ E.g. Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 26-30, faults Martin, *Body*, 12, 15, for interpreting Stoic physics within Hellenism *in general*, which leads him to deny any distinction between the material and the immaterial.

⁴¹¹ Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 31.

⁴¹² *Holy Spirit*, 35, 78-9. Rabens appropriates the liquid imagery associated with the Spirit (e.g. ‘pouring’, etc.) not as literal physical descriptions but as metaphors in line with the theories of Soskice and

between a physical πνεῦμα and ethical transformation through pneumatic infusion means that the above proposals for the Spirit as substance have little historical grounding.

Below I will provide what I believe to be an alternative to the substantial union between Spirit and water in terms of what James W. Fernandez has called ‘metaphoric predication’, which provides a ritual explanation for the relationship between the Spirit and ritual washing while at the same time avoiding the critical pitfalls of the ontological proposal elucidated above.

Symbolic interpretations. In recent years, there have been dissenting opinions from the sacramental scholarly consensus, each of which denies a direct correlation between the initiation washing and the experience of the Spirit in 1 Cor 12:13. Dunn, the most prominent initial dissenter,⁴¹³ argues that baptismal allusions in passages such as Gal 3:27 and 1 Cor 12:13 are best understood as metaphors rather than as descriptions of the actual practice of physical washing.⁴¹⁴ He notices that when the language of purification indicative of the OT (e.g. Ps 51:7) is picked up in the NT, that language leaves behind the cultic sphere of ritual purity in exchange for an inward or spiritual cleansing (cf. Cornelius’ heart in Acts 15:9). Even the sign of circumcision, which appears parallel to baptism in Col 2:11, has a long history of metaphorical use for the circumcised heart (Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4; 9:25-26; Ezek 44:9; 1QS 5:5; etc).⁴¹⁵ Thus, for Dunn, the Holy Spirit is associated neither with water-baptism on the one hand nor with a post-conversion Spirit-baptism on the other, but with a pattern or process of conversion-initiation into the new covenant. By ‘conversion-initiation’ Dunn refers to a process that involves both water-baptism and

the more inward, subjective (even mystical) aspects of the whole event like repentance, forgiveness, union with Christ. I shall therefore use ‘initiation’ to describe the ritual, external acts as distinct from these latter, and “conversion” when we are thinking of that inner transformation as distinct from, or rather without including the ritual acts. The total event of becoming a Christian embraces both “conversion” and “initiation”, and so we shall call it ‘conversion-initiation’.⁴¹⁶

Fowler. See his detailed discussion on the criteria of metaphor on pp. 43-54.

⁴¹³ Though Dunn, *Baptism*, 130, references the similar positions of Markus Barth in his 1951 *Die Taufe ein Sakrament?*, among others.

⁴¹⁴ Dunn, *Baptism*, 127-131; see also his “‘Baptized’,” 294-310.

⁴¹⁵ Dunn, “‘Baptized’,” 300-01.

⁴¹⁶ *Baptism*, 6-7.

In a similar vein, Gordon Fee, in his massive tome on the Holy Spirit in the letters of Paul, has noted that most commentaries simply assume the ritual denotation of the verb βαπτίζειν in 12:13 without so much as raising a single line of inquiry scrutinising such a link.⁴¹⁷ This assumption within the consensus, then, provides the grounds for linking the conferral of the Spirit with the water baptism rite. For Fee, however, the text actually evidences a clear distinction between the water rite and the gift of the Spirit, noting that “it is *not* baptism but the *one* Spirit, repeated in both clauses, that in Paul’s present argument is the basis for unity (cf. vv. 4-11).”⁴¹⁸ In fact, Fee denies any specific tie that links the reception of the Spirit with baptism in the Pauline corpus, the rite being more associated with the Lordship of Christ than with pneumatic presence. Furthermore, the metaphorical nature of the parallel clause in v. 13c regarding the ‘drinking of the Spirit’ is presented as evidence of a Semitic parallelism which argues strongly for a metaphorical meaning for ‘baptism’ in the first clause.⁴¹⁹

I believe these challenges to the consensus have clearly demonstrated a nearsightedness among scholars who did little more than assume the denotation of the water rite in 1 Cor 12:13 (and, perhaps by parallel implication, Gal 3:27).⁴²⁰ From a historical-critical perspective, this assumption is hardly justifiable. Yet, in providing a careful and nuanced reading of 1 Cor 12:13, Dunn and Fee have not only overlooked important performative indicators and ritual conditions embedded in the text, but have in fact revealed considerably more than their own proposals adequately address.

Let me begin with the latter observation. Both Dunn and Fee appeal exclusively to a *literary* or *linguistic* appropriation of metaphor, even though acknowledging that Paul is drawing from language associated with ritual washing.⁴²¹ The methodological problem

⁴¹⁷ Gordon Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 179, n.364.

⁴¹⁸ *God’s Empowering Presence*, 179.

⁴¹⁹ *God’s Empowering Presence*, 179-80.

⁴²⁰ An example might be J. Paul Sampley’s commentary on 1 Corinthians, who devotes little more than a couple of pithy paragraphs to this verse, simply asserting the presence of a “baptismal tradition” (“First Corinthians,” in L.E. Keck [ed.], *New Interpreter’s Bible* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2002], 945.)

⁴²¹ Cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 106, who observes that Dunn’s position rests on “a number of *linguistic* judgments regarding the nature of metaphors” (emphasis added). Dunn, “Baptizing,” 296, grounds his understanding of metaphor in the study of Janet Martin Soskice, who observes that metaphors are ways of saying that which cannot be said literally, or which a literal description would be inadequate to describe. As such, ‘metaphor’ is, in the world of literary criticism, a type of trope, that is, a figure where the meaning of an individual word or phrase is altered or inflected.

here is the failure to recognise that metaphor can be appropriated very differently in cultural anthropology than in literary theory. Indeed, metaphor and metonymy or synecdoche have been the topics of intense investigation among anthropologists since Lévi-Strauss' *The Savage Mind*.⁴²² For example, James Fernandez has observed a reciprocal relationship between metaphors and metonymies in ritualised activity.⁴²³ In a religious context, metaphors give rise to a series of ritualised acts and utterances, what Fernandez calls 'ceremonial scenes', such that a single metaphor becomes representative of a number of contiguously related scenes which it generates. For example, if one is to be a contemporary part of the mystical body of Christ, that is, if one is to be identified with the predicate 'body of Christ', then one must purify her or his body through confession, discipline it through genuflection, hear of the life of that actual Christ through Scripture, and finally, through Communion, achieve a state conforming to the image-plan. "Through such ceremonial scenes, men become the metaphor [body of Christ] predicated upon them."⁴²⁴ What is important to note here is that metaphors (e.g. the body of Christ), by generating contiguously related acts and utterances, in fact become representative of a larger network of associations, and as such transform into metonymies. In short, a person becomes identified with a metaphor by participating in the metaphor's metonymic relationship to the sign-images it generates.⁴²⁵

We may see now how ritual logic renders obsolete the choice between baptism as a metaphor versus a rite. In order for one to be identified with the metaphor 'baptism in the Spirit', one would need to participate in associated 'ceremonial scenes' such as water baptism that are related contiguously to the metaphor, thus rendering the metaphor a

⁴²² See, e.g. S.J. Tambiah, "The Magical Power of Words," *Man* n.s. 3, no. 2 (1968): 188, 202; George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (University of Chicago Press, 1981), 233-35; Robert E. Innis, "The Tacit Logic of Ritual Embodiments," in Don Handelman and Galina Lindquist (eds.), *Ritual in Its Own Right* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 197-212; Bell, *Ritual Theory*, 50-52, 64-5, 74; Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Cornell University Press, 1975); Thomas J. Csordas, "Prophecy and the Performance of Metaphor," *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 99, No. 2 (June 1997): 321-32. See further the work of Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), where *tenor* and *vehicle* constitutive of metaphor are integral to the knowing process.

⁴²³ "The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture," *Current Anthropology* 15 (1974): 119-146. Cf. a similar analysis of the reciprocity between metaphor and metonymy in Edmund Leach, *Culture and Communication: the logic by which symbols are connected* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 9ff.

⁴²⁴ Fernandez, "Mission," 125.

⁴²⁵ "Mission," 126-27.

metonymy. In accordance with the example above, just as being a part of the contemporary ‘body of Christ’ *is* participating in confession and Communion, so being ‘baptised in the Spirit’ *is* participating in water baptism. Thus, even if we grant Paul’s troping of baptism into a wider Spirit-association in 1 Cor 12:13, water baptism would still be situated within a network of metonymic associations contiguously related to Spirit-baptism, with the mention of the latter legitimately giving rise to association with the former. This accounts for why there is simply no explicit evidence for Paul placing Spirit-baptism in antithesis to water-baptism.⁴²⁶

Secondly, Dunn’s conversion-initiation paradigm as described above (i.e. internal-external or private-public) is misleading. Conversion in the ancient world, when it obtained, was a highly public phenomenon and could not be sequestered to private psychological processes.⁴²⁷ Thomas M. Finn’s study on ritual and conversion in antiquity argues that “conversion in Greco-Roman religion, whether Pagan, Jewish, or Christian, was an extended ritual process that combined teaching and symbolic enactment – the cognitive and the performative – and yielded commitment and transformation.”⁴²⁸ He notes that the intense process of conversion involved in the Pythagorean school as observed by Iamblichus, the prolonged initiation of Lucius in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, and the seven stages of Mithraic initiation, all exemplify set characteristics of conversion indicative of modern research.⁴²⁹

The public nature of conversion was especially true of Judaism.⁴³⁰ Shaye Cohen’s analysis of conversion to Judaism in late antiquity underlines the importance of the social

⁴²⁶ Cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 106.

⁴²⁷ For studies on conversion in general and early Christian conversion in particular, see William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902); A.D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933); Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 72-114; Chester, *Conversion, passim*; Wayne Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 18-36; Ramsay MacMullen, “Two types of Conversion in Early Christianity,” in Ferguson, *Conversion*, 1-25. Cf. the comments of Rambo: “It is my view that religious action – regularized, sustained, and intentional – is fundamental to the conversion experience. Ritual fosters the necessary orientation, the readiness of mind and soul to have a conversion experience, and it consolidates conversion after the initial experience.” See Lewis R. Rambo, *Understanding Religious Conversion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 114.

⁴²⁸ Thomas M. Finn, *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1997), 9.

⁴²⁹ Finn, *Death*, 15.

⁴³⁰ Cf. Segal, *Paul*, 134: “The idea of defining the conversion experience in terms of a ritual requirement is commonplace in Judaism.”

aspects of conversion, noting that “without social conversion – that is, without the integration of the gentile into Jewish society – there is no conversion at all; the gentile remains a gentile.”⁴³¹ This social integration involved the semiotic of circumcision for men, which had the multivocalic significance of theological conversion (turning to faith in the God of the Jews; cf. Achior in Judith 14:10) and commitment to observe Torah (as per Josephus, who understands “circumcision” and “Torah obligations” as synonymous; cf. Metilius’ conversion in *B.J.* 2.454). “No matter what its import, circumcision was essential; without it social conversion for men was impossible.”⁴³² With regard to rabbinic Judaism, Cohen observes how the advent of a formal conversion ceremony brought conversion into the public order. “A gentile could no longer simply claim to be a convert and could no longer convert to Judaism on his own.... The conversion process involves formal interaction with native Jews ...”⁴³³ This conversion process involved acceptance of the commandments, circumcision, and ritualised lustration, all of which were done publicly.

Moreover, Paul’s adoption of the body-as-society topos in relation to the baptismal reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in 12:12-13 has a ritualised precedent. In masterfully demonstrating the influence of *homonoia* or *concordia* speeches on Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, Margaret M. Mitchell observes parallels between Paul’s ritualisation of the political body in baptism and the precedent of rooting political unity in a shared ritual life.⁴³⁴ In the Graeco-Roman world, both allies and reunited factions express their unity through common sacrifices (Dionysius, *Ant. rom.* 4.25.4-5; 26.3; 6.6.1, 79.2) and meals (Lucan *B. Civ.* 4.196-98). Dionysius describes the ‘Latin Festivals’, which commemorate the alliance of forty-seven cities in peaceful union with Rome under Tarquinius, at which symbolically ‘one bull is sacrificed in common by all of them, each city receiving its appointed share of the meat’ (*Ant. rom.* 4.49.3). Dio Chrysostom calls the Apaemeians to unity with the people of Prusa “since they are men with whom you have common

⁴³¹ *Beginnings of Jewishness* 168. Cohen qualifies such conversion as not necessarily entailing “equality between the convert and the native born,” noting that “converts to Judaism could not attain full equality with the native born because they lacked the blood lineage that was an essential part of the ethnic part of the Jewish self-definition” (169).

⁴³² Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 169. Cohen notes that by the late first or second century CE, baptism became *the* conversion ritual for women (170).

⁴³³ *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 223-4.

⁴³⁴ Mitchell, *Paul*, 141. Mitchell herself observes that in Paul’s Christian communities, baptism and the eucharist are analogous unifying rites (141 n. 458).

[κοινοί] ties of wedlock, offspring, civic institutions, sacrifices to the gods [θυσία θεῶν], festive assemblies, and spectacles” (*Or.* 41.10; cf. *Or.* 38.22 where Dio makes a similar appeal: “Besides, you worship the same gods as they do, and in most cases you conduct your festivals as they do”).⁴³⁵ In perhaps the most well-known example of the political body topos, Livy’s recounting of Menenius Agrippa’s fable in his *Ab Urbe Condita*, 2.32.9-12, is situated socially in relation to the performance of the *lustratio* that permeated Roman society from governors to children. It was the participation in the characteristic encirclement of the *lustratio* that imprinted society upon the individual body.⁴³⁶ Aelius Aristides, in a speech on social concord, appeals to the role of liturgical respect toward temples as indispensable to the ‘health’ of the ‘body politic’ (*Or.* 23.30-31). Thus, it is interesting that all of Paul’s other references to the ‘body’ motif appear either within earshot of a ‘washing’ reference, as in 6:14-15 (cf. 6:11), or are linked explicitly to ritualised activity, as per the eating and drinking references in 10:17 and 11:29.

Hence, Fee’s characterisation of Paul’s appropriation of the body-as-society topos as merely metaphorical is misleading: the topos entailed a somatic conception of the public order that was in fact ritualised and thus *realised* (palpably manifest in space and time) in variegated ways. It should therefore be no surprise to find linked with the political body in 1 Cor 12:12 a reference to ritualised language in 12:13, particularly in light of its precedent in 10:17 and 11:29, which describes the performative constitution of a single unified public body. Thus, while *experience* is clearly evident in 1 Cor 12:13, it cannot be appropriated by a *subjective* experience or even a common or shared *private* experience alone; rather, a ritualised social body as *publicly* demonstrated and experienced is that which accounts for the formation of social contract and ethical obligation both theoretically and historically.

Thirdly, while Dunn and Fee acknowledge that baptism was the initiation rite of the early church, they ignore that initiations, in their establishment of social contract and ethical obligation, attribute key identity markers of the community to the initiate. For van Gennepe, the transformative feature of ritual was integral to the sequential structure of

⁴³⁵ Translation by H. Lamar Crosby, *Dio Chrysostom: Discourses 37-60* (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 159, 71; Cf. Mitchell, *Paul and Rhetoric*, 141 n.459.

⁴³⁶ Andrew Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 118.

ritual, particularly evident in initiation rituals, where the non-recurrent performance of the tripartite rite of passage structure of separation, transition and incorporation effects a change in the initiate's status. Ritualised transformations involving boundary crossings are effected through the distinctive way in which ritual performances relate individual persons to superindividual structure, usually manifested in the individual participant's performative enactment of a mythological narrative important to the initiating group.⁴³⁷ By performing acts and utterances specific to the community, the participant embodies the identifying verbal and conventional constituents of the community and is thus somatically transformed from *outsider* to *insider* by means of this individual/ group reciprocity.

The *predicative* significance of initiations therefore renders the sharp distinction made by both Dunn and Fee between the baptism rite and the conferral of the Spirit superfluous. Because rituals palpably predicate the key identifying markers of the community upon the initiate in ritualised action, the ritual media of a pneumatically-circumscribed community would function as *contiguous extensions* of that pneumatic identity, making such an identity palpably shared and substantially experienced. Neither can Fee's insistence that Paul associates water-baptism unambiguously only with reference to Christ, not the Spirit, as per 1 Cor 1:10-17; Gal 3:27; Rom 6:3-4; etc., be sustained.⁴³⁸ Fee is well aware that the Spirit is associated with the nature of the Christian community on the one hand and with their distinct ethical identity on the other.⁴³⁹ What seems to escape Fee is that these social and ethical frames of reference are precisely what are predicated upon initiates in their ritualised initiations, which, in the case of early Christian circles, appears effected by the proclamation of Christ's Lordship over the baptised, a dominical utterance that Paul considered a pneumatic proclamation (1 Cor 12:3; cf. 1:13; Rom 6:3-4)! Said differently, if the social and ethical obligations inherent in the baptismal rite are themselves defined, constituted and actualised by the Spirit, the

⁴³⁷ See *Ritual and Identity*, *passim*; Mircea Eliade, *Birth and Rebirth: The Religious Meanings of Initiation and Human Culture*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958); M. Bloch, *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); J.A.M. Snoek, J.A.M. Snoek, *Initiations: A Methodological Approach to the Application of Classification and Definition Theory in the Study of Rituals* (Pijnacker: Dutch Efficiency Bureau, 1987), 173.

⁴³⁸ *God's Empowering Presence*, 862.

⁴³⁹ See *God's Empowering Presence*, 872-883, where Fee develops these pneumatic frames of reference back to back.

washing rite would signify a materialised manifestation of that pneumatic reality, making it impossible to sequester the rite from the pneumatic nature of that social solidarity. Christ and the Spirit thus become key identity markers ritually inscribed on the body for a life lived in relation to the Christian community.

Fourthly, these cross-cultural and ritual observations provide further grounding for the several form-critical characteristics that we surveyed above as regards Gal 3:26-29 which have led many scholars to believe that Paul is here quoting a baptismal formula used either by the churches at Galatia or by the entire early Church. Surprisingly, these form-critical issues are not even discussed by Fee or Dunn!

The foregoing evidence, in my opinion, points overwhelmingly to the fact that attempts to disengage water baptism from an encounter with the Spirit are futile and misleading in the face of 1 Cor 12:13. It should not be inferred from this conclusion that I believe baptism to have been the *only* means by which one could be predicated with or encounter the Spirit, but simply that the Spirit appears to have been encountered in ways specific to the ritualised washing, ways that I shall interrogate below. These metaphoric proposals have attempted to address ritual language in the Pauline epistles irrespective of ritual theory, and as such have not availed themselves of the performative mechanisms of ritual embodiment and the interpretive significance such mechanisms can have for the text.

5.3. The Relationship Between ποτίζω and βαπτίζειν

As regards Paul's peculiar phrase πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν in 1 Cor 12:13c, there are three lines of interpretation.

First, a number of scholars have taken advantage of the semantic range of ποτίζειν and have seen v. 13c as an addendum to the βαπτίζειν reference in v. 13a. The term ποτίζειν generally connotes 'to hydrate' or 'give to drink' regardless if the recipient is human, animal, or vegetation.⁴⁴⁰ While the Lord's Supper involves drinking, the aorist tense ἐποτίσθημεν in v. 13c suggests a non-recurrent past event that parallels the aorist ἐβαπτίσθημεν in contrast to the recurrent nature of the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴¹ And the fact that

⁴⁴⁰ See, e.g., "ποτίζω," in *EDNT*, 142; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 591; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 463; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 212.

⁴⁴¹ Schrage, *Der erste Brief: III*, 217-8; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 289; Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 299..

both verbs are linked to the unifying work of the Spirit suggests an allusion to the Jewish prophecies promising a future outpouring of God's Spirit (e.g. LXX Ezek 36:25-27; Joel 3:1-2; Isa 29:10; Zech 12:10).⁴⁴² Thus, Beasley-Murray translates the phrase: 'saturated in his outpouring',⁴⁴³ while Schnackenburg renders the clause: 'All have been drenched over and over (through the overflowing) of the one Spirit'.⁴⁴⁴ Ferguson translates 1 Cor 12:13 as 'and we all were watered with the one Spirit', the drinking/watering options signifying the initiate's receiving the Spirit into her/himself or being saturated by the influence of the Spirit. The verse may thus express two aspects of the working of the Spirit in baptism.⁴⁴⁵

The second strand of scholarship understands πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν as a reference to the cup of the Lord's Supper (cf. 1 Cor 10:16, 21; 11:26-28).⁴⁴⁶ Of interest here is how 12:13 parallels 1 Cor 10:2-4. There Paul speaks of the Israelites not only being 'baptised' in the cloud and sea (ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, v. 2), but also they all drank 'the same spiritual drink' (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα, v. 4). These parallels bolster the fact that ποτίζειν usually connotes 'drinking' when referring to humans (as opposed to 'watering' when referring to agriculture).⁴⁴⁷ Martin's conception of a material πνεῦμα leads to his observation that "the Eucharistic reception of the three necessary nutrients of solid food, liquid beverage, and Spirit through the digestive system correlates well with the understanding of nutrition in the ancient medical texts."⁴⁴⁸

Thirdly, the metaphoric interpretation of βαπτίζειν draws heavily from what has been considered a more explicit example of metaphor in Paul's use of the verb ποτίζειν. Thus Dunn sees a metaphoric conception of βαπτίζειν confirmed by Paul's use of ποτίζειν when he writes: "That Paul is speaking of spiritual realities and spiritual relationships in metaphorical language is confirmed by 12.13c, where ποτίζειν also refers simply to the

⁴⁴² Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 109-10; Garlington, *1 Corinthians*, 591; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 170; Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 299.

⁴⁴³ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 170, 276.

⁴⁴⁴ Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 85.

⁴⁴⁵ Ferguson, *Baptism*, 174, 176.

⁴⁴⁶ Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 84, observes that quite noteworthy names in the history of Christianity have subscribed to this interpretation, among them Cyril of Alexandria, Thomas Aquinas and the Reformers (e.g. Calvin and Luther). Contemporary advocates include E. Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 176, and L. Goppelt, "πίνω κτλ.," *TDNT* 6:159.

⁴⁴⁷ Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie* (FRLANT 154; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 174-5, citing Sir 15:3; Jer 16:7.

⁴⁴⁸ Martin, "Statements," 118.

Corinthians' experience of Spirit in conversion (aorist) – *not* to baptism, the Lord's Supper, or confirmation, as most commentators seem to think.⁴⁴⁹ Fee, too, sees Paul's use of a metaphor in v. 13c as confirming his use of a metaphor in v. 13a by appealing to semitic parallelism, "where both clauses make essentially the same point."⁴⁵⁰

We shall begin with the third line of interpretation and work backwards. Few scholars have been convinced by the force of the argument that if a verb is modified by another verb which happens to be a metaphor, then the modified verb must be as well.⁴⁵¹ There is simply no necessity to this logic at all. Having said that, I do believe that Dunn and Fee are correct in surmising that ποτίζειν modifies βαπτίζειν. There are two reasons. First, it is difficult to argue how the parallel usage of the verbs (first-person plural aorists) both in connection with the Spirit and confirming the unity of Jew-Gentile and slave-free are not in fact modifying one another. Secondly, there is little if any evidence that πνεῦμα was understood as a drink in the Jewish or Graeco-Roman worlds.⁴⁵² The parallels with 1 Cor 10:2-4 are not so apparent if the term πνευματικός refers to water and food provided miraculously by the Spirit in order to sustain the people in the desert.⁴⁵³ And given that there is no evidence that drinking took place at baptism, we are left with appropriating ποτίζειν as a metaphoric or descriptive amplification of βαπτίζειν. The question of how we are to translate ποτίζειν will be dealt with below.

The question before us now is whether there is a ritual logic that can explain satisfactorily the relationship between βαπτίζειν and πνεῦμα in 12:13a and ποτίζειν in 12:13c. On the one hand, while we agreed with the sacramental line of interpretation for 12:13a, we left *explaining* the relationship between the Spirit and baptism unresolved. Thus, our ritual logic will need to resolve the question of just how baptism communicated the Spirit to believers. On the other hand, the ritual logic we use will need to find a place for appropriating ποτίζειν within that resolution. I will propose a different relationship between the Spirit and baptism than those outlined above. It will be argued that the Spirit is communicated to the initiate through a ritual process termed 'metaphoric predication'.

⁴⁴⁹ *Baptism*, 130-1.

⁴⁵⁰ *First Epistle*, 604-5; cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 1000-1001.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 289.

⁴⁵² Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 113-19; Fee, *First Epistle*, 604.

⁴⁵³ Fee, *First Epistle*, 447; cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 117. See Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 241ff., who maps out four possible interpretations for the references to 'spiritual food and drink' in 1 Cor 10:2-4.

I will develop this view on the basis of an explanation of what metaphoric predication entails and an exegetical study of the Corinthian correspondence in light of an Ezek 36:25-27 tradition that formed a significant part of the contextual milieu for Paul's pneumatology.

5.4. Metaphoric Predication

As I observed earlier, anthropological theory informs us that rites of passage often involve iconicity or metaphor in identity construction, a subject broached by van Gennep. He noted that rites were often composed of actions that seem formally similar to that which they seek to accomplish. Rites of separation, for instance, include some kind of ritualised physical separation, such as the cutting of hair or foreskin.⁴⁵⁴ But the ritual tokens are not merely iconic, that is, signs do not merely *resemble* their significata. Rappaport argues that behind this iconicity is the material substantiation of the incorporeal. Abstract concepts such as worth, wealth, or influence, being impalpable, often have to be materially represented if they are going to be taken seriously. "Corporeal representation gives weight to the incorporeal and gives visible substance to aspects of existence which are themselves impalpable, but of great importance in the ordering of social life."⁴⁵⁵

Rappaport's observation draws in part from the work of James W. Fernandez, who has highlighted the importance of the ritualised substantiation of the insubstantial for identity formation. Fernandez argues that in the context of ritualisation predicative metaphors (e.g. 'you are all sons of God') transform substantially into a series of ceremonial scenes which enable participants to embody and thus be identified with the metaphors at hand. The acting and speaking of the ritual performers generate what Fernandez terms 'sign-images' which function to substantiate, to make palpable, abstract concepts. These abstract concepts are in turn predicated on the participants in their ritualised performances and through such predication induce a transformation of the experience of the participants. A ritual is thus analysed as "a series of organizing images or metaphors put into operation by a series of superordinate and subordinate ceremonial

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. *Rites*, 166; Rappaport, *Ritual*, 140-41.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ritual*, 141.

scenes,” with each scene functioning to predicate symbolic messages upon the participants, so that “men become the metaphor predicated upon them.”⁴⁵⁶

The important insight here is that in ritualisation notions so abstract that words can barely grasp them are represented by material signs. The most abstract products of human thought and feeling are thus made substantial and in being made substantial, they are made comprehensible. As the participant realises the incorporeal order in her or his performance of ritualised acts, the transmission and reception of the transcendent order become fused in the participant. Rappaport argues that the self or agent is constituted by the use of the body, since it is the body which defines the self of the performer for himself and others. A movement or posture is directly and immediately sensible to the performer as something inseparable from her or his being. The knees s/he bends, the head s/he bows are not ephemeral and they are not dispensable. As such, the use of the body defines the self of the performer for himself and others. A movement or posture is directly and immediately sensible to the performer as something inseparable from his or her being.⁴⁵⁷

The question before us is whether metaphors associated with the Spirit may have given rise to ‘ceremonial scenes’ or ‘sign-images’ such as baptism that would function as the primary means by which one would be attributed or identified with such a metaphor. What I will explore below is that while non-literal usages of a future ‘pouring out’ or ‘washing’ of the Spirit abound in the Hebrew Bible and subsequent Judaism, there is one passage in particular that has been inordinately influential in associating the gift of God’s Spirit with a water cleansing, Ezek 36:25-27. I will argue that it is this passage and its subsequent tradition that provides not only the contextual milieu for Paul’s eschatological pneumatology, but indeed temporal, ethical and communal frames of reference evident in Paul’s understanding of baptism.

5.5. The Purifying Spirit: The Ezekiel 36 Tradition in Second-Temple Judaism

The Hebrew Bible abounds with metaphorical descriptions of God’s presence with pouring or cleansing imagery. Perhaps drawing from the image of God’s forgiveness as a cleansing agent throughout the penitential Ps 51 (vv. 1-2, 7, 10), the eschatological

⁴⁵⁶ “Mission,” 125.

⁴⁵⁷ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 146.

expectations of the restoration of Israel in the age of the Spirit consistently attribute God's acts with a purifying efficacy. God promises an eschatological purification, where he "shall purify the sons of Levi" in Mal 3:3 and cleanse his people by an eschatological sprinkling of water in Zech 13:1 (cf. Isa 1:15; 4:4; Jer 4:14; 33:8). Zechariah includes the promise that "living waters will flow out of Jerusalem" and water the earth as they once did in Paradise (14:8). The prophet Joel, whose promise that God will "pour out his Spirit" in the last days (2:28-32) was foundational for the Pentecost narrative in Acts 2 (cf. vv. 17-21), writes: "... the mountains shall drip sweet wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the stream beds of Judah shall flow with water; and a fountain shall come forth from the house of the Lord and water the valley of Shittim" (3:18). Echoes of the original 'river of life' in the garden of Eden can be seen flowing from the throne of God in the temple (Gen 2:10; Ezek 47:1-2; cf. Rev 22:1). At Qumran, passages such as CD A III 15-17 associate the presence of God with a life-giving reservoir, and 1QH XVI 4-11, 16 sees God's presence in relation to the living water of paradise. Indeed, "the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Hab 2:14; cf. Isa 11:9).

Within this complex of eschatological anticipation of the Spirit, there is one passage in particular that had an inordinate influence on post-biblical sectarian Jewish literature, Ezek 36:25-27:

I will sprinkle (זָרַקְ) clean water (מַיִם טְהוֹרִים) on you, and you will be clean; I will cleanse you from all your uncleannesses, and from your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my Spirit (רוּחִי) within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances.

There are four things to note in this passage. The first is that this passage is a divine *promise* that God will in the *future* deal decisively with the problem of Israel's disobedience represented by their "idolatry" in v. 25 (36:18; cf. 20:7, 18, 30, 31; 22:3-4; 23:7, 30; 37:23). The vision of Ezek 36:16-38 involves the manner in which the redemption from exile and return to the presence of God will be accomplished, reflected in the fact that all of the verbs in the passage are in the future tense, pointing to a *time* in

the future when God will restore his people.⁴⁵⁸ The passage is thus incessantly *eschatological* in nature.⁴⁵⁹

The second thing to note is the imagery of ritual cleansing used by Ezekiel in v. 25 in relation to the gift of God's Spirit (cf. 36:33; 37:23). Ezekiel combines the verb זָרַק (LXX ῥαίνω) with the phrase מִים טְהוֹרִים (LXX ὕδωρ καθάρος) to create a motif of 'water cleansing' which points forward to a time when God will put his Spirit in his people (36:27).⁴⁶⁰ Block sees the washing description as mixing metaphors of priestly cleansing rituals and blood sprinkling ceremonies (cf. Exod 29:4; Num 8:7; Lev 16:4, 24, 26).⁴⁶¹ References to God's own Spirit occur primarily in exilic and post-exilic literature and generally with reference to the rescue of Israel from exile and the restoration of her covenant relationship to God (cf. Isa 42:1; 44:3; 59:21; Joel 3:1-2; Hag 2:5; Zech 4:6; 6:8).⁴⁶² And as Mein notes: "ritual purity is the precondition for access to the cult, and, for Ezekiel, access to the cult is fundamental to the relationship between YHWH and his people."⁴⁶³

Third, the promise is corporate in nature. Note the use of second-person plurals throughout. Dumbrell observes that the newness of the "new" spirit involves the democratization of the Spirit which was unprecedented in Israel's history. "Previously the gift of the Spirit was spasmodic and associated with Israel's leadership, generally confined to judges, kings, and prophets. Now it is extended to the people of God as a

⁴⁵⁸ William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 95.

⁴⁵⁹ Horace D. Hummel, *Ezekiel*, 2 Vols. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007), II.1053. By 'eschatological', I am referring to the implications of the broader phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν or 'at the end of days' which the Septuagint, post-biblical and NT literature use to designate the *telos* or goal of cosmic history. See the discussion in Albert L.A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 2-6.

⁴⁶⁰ The majority of scholars interpret 'heart' and 'spirit' in v. 26 as *anthropological* in distinction from the divine Spirit in v. 27. See, e.g., Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 2 Vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), II.355; see the discussion in Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology* (WUNT II/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 38-42.

⁴⁶¹ Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, II:354.

⁴⁶² Philip, *Origins*, 40.

⁴⁶³ Andrew Mein, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 152.

whole.”⁴⁶⁴ The pericope thus involves the reestablishment of God’s covenantal formula in v. 28: “you will be my people, and I will be your God” (11:20; 14:11; 37:23, 27).⁴⁶⁵

Fourth, the purpose of God’s gifting his people with his Spirit is to bring about a renewed obedience to himself. It is God who will take the initiate and he will *cause* ($\eta\psi\epsilon$; LXX, ποιήσω) them to follow his statutes and keep his ordinances.⁴⁶⁶ Ezekiel’s promise involves God’s reconstituting the ‘heart’ of his people, the place of human moral response (cf. Ezek 11:19-20; Deut 6:4-5; 30:6). Against the backdrop of passages such as Josh 24:23, 1 Kgs 8:48 and 2 Kgs 23:25, “the gift of a new heart enables the people to correctly observe Yahweh’s statutes and ordinances.”⁴⁶⁷

A number of subsequent texts appear to be influenced by the temporal, pneumatic, corporate and ethical frames of reference embedded in Ezek 36:25-27. We shall examine a selection from Qumran, post-biblical and NT literature as they provide a hermeneutical horizon and contextual milieu for Paul’s understanding of the arrival of the Spirit.

Perhaps nowhere else is the Ezekiel promise of the Spirit featured more prominently than among the texts at Qumran.⁴⁶⁸ There are several allusions to Ezekiel 36 in 1QS, the *Rule of the Community*. In describing the annual covenant renewal ceremony where initiates are united to the community, 1QS III 4-9 reads:

He will not become clean by the acts of atonement, nor shall he be purified by the cleansing waters, nor shall he be made holy by seas or rivers, nor shall he be purified by all the water of ablution. Defiled, defiled shall he be all the days he spurns the decrees of God, without allowing himself to be taught by the Community of his counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man, all his iniquities, so that he can look at the light of life. And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed of all his iniquities. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility his sin is atoned. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance.⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁴ Dumbrell, *End of the Beginning*, 95.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. Mein, *Ezekiel*, 221, who says of this formula: “This is always expressed in plural form, addressing all the members of the people of Israel together.”

⁴⁶⁶ Block, *Ezekiel*, II.356.

⁴⁶⁷ Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*, JSOTSup 358 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 93; cf., further, on the eternal nature of this obedience in Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel’s Use of the Holiness Code* (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2009), 122-7.

⁴⁶⁸ Otto Betz, “Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament,” *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958/59): 213-234; Philip, *Origins*, 85 n.27, notes that the Ezekiel manuscripts (1QEzek; 4QEzek ^{a-c}; 11QEzek; MasEzek) are severely fragmented and do not contain Ezek 36:25-27.

There are three important features in this passage. First, there is the link between the reference to “the holy spirit of the community” with “cleansing waters ... holy by seas or rivers ... purified by all the water of ablution” (4-5) and being “sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance” (8-9). This experience of the communal Spirit is linked with washings that Baumgarten suggests are not “mere metaphor;” rather, כפורים and מי נדה refer to actual washing practices that represent alternative forms of ritual bathing: “this water was apparently thought of as effective for purification, not only from corpse impurity, but from other impurities as well.”⁴⁷⁰ This passage makes clear that any washings *apart from the Spirit* of the community are ineffectual. It is in this respect that Levison suggests that the sprinkling of waters may indicate the communal purification of Ezek 36:25-27.⁴⁷¹

The pneumatic efficacy of the washings leads to the second important feature. As Levison has noted, this passage parallels Ezek 36:25-27 (cf. 1QS IX 3-6) in its *communal* conception of the Spirit.⁴⁷² The Spirit exists in the community in a way that is irreducible to the individual; the Spirit exists in a *unity* of holiness into which the individual is aggregated by virtue of her or his submission to the community’s instruction. Levison notes that this emphasis on the communal dimension of the Spirit mirrors the promise of Ezekiel where the gift of the Spirit is promised to a corporate body rather than to individuals. “This gift would establish afresh the relationship between God and the people as a whole, who are consistently addressed in the second person plural: ‘A new heart I will give you (plural), and a new spirit I will put within your midst ... I will put my spirit within you (plural).’ The result will be a communal renewal of the Sinaitic covenant between God and the people: ‘you shall be my people, and I will be your God’ (Ezek 36:26, 28).”⁴⁷³

Thirdly, there is an incessant emphasis on ethical identity. The “compliance of the soul with the laws of God” parallels the Ezekiel promise to create a new ethical

⁴⁶⁹ Translation from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 2 Vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997 [Vol. 1] 1998 [Vol. 2]), I:75.

⁴⁷⁰ J. Baumgarten, et al (eds.) *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 92; cf. Jonathan D. Lawrence, *Washing in Water*, 139 n.145; 143 n. 155; Pierpaolo Bertalotto, “Immersion and Expiation: Water and Spirit from Qumran to John the Baptist,” *Henoch* 27/1-2 (2005): 163-181, 168.

⁴⁷¹ *Filled*, 216 n. 18.

⁴⁷² *Filled*, 215.

⁴⁷³ *Filled*, 207.

disposition among his people that will fulfill the law's requirements (cf. Ezek 36:26-27; 37:14). Apart from the realisation of this promise in the community, one's moral and ritual acts remain "defiled," since apart from participating in the fulfillment of Ezek 36:25-27 one cannot but "spurn the decrees of God." This ethical significance of the Spirit is developed in the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, where the psalmist is overwhelmed by his sinful condition and relies on God's compassionate cleansing and justice (1QH^a XII 33-39). The psalmist is thus "strengthening myself through your holy spirit, and clinging to the truth of your covenant, and serving you in truth and (with) a perfect heart ... (1QH^a VIII 25).⁴⁷⁴ John Bertone comments: "The adjective 'perfect/whole' in combination with 'heart' commonly connotes the idea of the 'completeness/wholeness' of the 'inner person's seat of mind, inclinations, resolutions' in serving God and keeping covenant relation."⁴⁷⁵

Another allusion to Ezekiel 36 appears in 1QS IV 18-22, the so-called 'Two Spirits Treatise', which describes how God has determined to end all worldwide injustice

on the appointed time of the visitation ... Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deeds [sic]. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement of the unclean spirit, in order to instruct the upright ones with the knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour.⁴⁷⁶

In this passage, the cleansing of the spirit of truth upon a distinctively ethical community (cf. "upright ones") is *temporally* framed, that is, such a cleansing will take place in the future "at the appointed time of the visitation." As A. Hogeterp writes: "1QS IV 19-20 defines this expected final age as a time of truth and an appointed time of judgment."⁴⁷⁷ However, as the *Thanksgiving Hymns* observe, this future cosmic purification is already being experienced proleptically by the community: "... I myself have chosen to cleanse my hands according to your wil[l]. The soul of your servant abhors every malicious deed

⁴⁷⁴ Translation from Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller (eds.), *1QHODAYOT^a* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), 117.

⁴⁷⁵ "The Law of the Spirit": *Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1-16* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005, 2007), 104. See, too, Arthur Everett Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 87-9; Philip, *Origins*, 84-6.

⁴⁷⁶ Translation from Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, I:79; cf. Lawrence, *Washing*, 120-23.

⁴⁷⁷ *Expectations*, 54, 287.

... and so I entreat you with the spirit that you have given to me that you make your kindness to your servant complete [for]ever, cleansing me by your holy spirit and drawing me nearer by your good favour, according to your great kindness ... and causing [my feet] to sta[nd in] the whole station of [your] good fa[vour], which you have cho[sen] for those who love you and for those who keep [your] commandments...” (1QH^a VIII 28-31; cf. 1QH^a V 36; 1QM V 11-12; 4Q400 1 I 14-16; 4Q511 35 1-5).⁴⁷⁸ Commenting on passages such as these, John Bertone observes: “This indicates that the Essenes believed the future promise spoken through the prophet was actualized in their own community; they possessed the eschatological Spirit and were consequently empowered to abide by the Law.”⁴⁷⁹

There is an additional Qumran text, 4QLevi^b ar, the Aramaic *Testament of Levi*, that is badly fragmented, but might be supplemented by the Mount Athos Greek version of the Aramaic *Testament of Levi* which also exemplifies an emphasis on washing, ethics, and the Spirit:

Then I laundered my garments, and having purified them in pure water, I also washed my whole self in living water, and I made all my paths straight. Then I lifted up my eyes and my countenance to heaven ... And I prayed and said ... ‘Make far from me, my Lord, the unrighteous spirit, and evil thought and fornication, *and* turn *pride* away from me. Let there be shown to me, O Lord, the holy spirit, and grant me counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength ... (Aramaic Levi Document 2:4-3:6).⁴⁸⁰

Levi tells how he washed his garments in ‘pure water’ (ῥδωρ καθαρόν), then washed his whole self in ‘living water’ (ζῶν ῥδωρ). The expression ῥδωρ καθαρόν (מים טהורים) occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Ezek 36:25, and the addition of the phrase ζῶν ῥδωρ which is used frequently to describe ritual water (cf. Lev 14:5, 50-52; 15:3) has the clear connotation of ritual purification. There is further a clear emphasis on ethical purity, where Levi ‘makes his paths straight’ and prays for the removal of immorality from his life. The source for such a deliverance is the ‘holy spirit’, similar to Isa 11:2: “The spirit of the Lord shall alight upon him: a spirit of wisdom and insight, a spirit of counsel and

⁴⁷⁸ Translation from Stegemann and Schuller, *IQHODAYOT*^a, 86.

⁴⁷⁹ “*The Law of the Spirit*,” 101-2. So, too, William H. Brownless, “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls,” in Krister Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 33-53, who suggests that the Ezekiel 36 promise was fulfilled in the ritual washings of the community in 1 QS 4:21 (p. 43).

⁴⁸⁰ Translation by Jonas C. Greenfield, *et al*, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha Vol 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 59-61; cf. Webb, *John the Baptist*, 116-20.

valor, a spirit of devotion and reverence for the Lord.”⁴⁸¹ Thus, this passage evidences an association between water, Spirit and ethics similar to the pattern at Qumran.

In addition to the Qumran texts, there are several post-biblical traditions based on Ezekiel 36, of which we shall briefly survey two: a passage from the *Book of Jubilees* and the baptism of John.⁴⁸²

There is a brief passage in the *Book of Jubilees* that should not be ignored, since it draws together in a particularly explicit fashion our four frames of reference of time, Spirit, community and ethics. In describing Moses’ intercession before God on Mt. Sinai on behalf of the people of Israel, we see an interpretation of the Spirit that conflates Moses’ intercession with language similar to Ezek 36:25-27:

I will create a holy spirit for them and will purify them in order that they may not turn away from me from that time forever. Their souls will adhere to me and to all my commandments. They will perform my commandments. I will become their father and they will become my children (*Jubilees* 1:23-24).⁴⁸³

Similar to Qumran, we see a *future* promise of *pneumatic purification* that will bring about an *ethical* transformation among God’s *people*. As Philip notes: “For the author of *Jubilees*, like Ezekiel, God’s restorative activity begins with regathering the people, transforming their hearts, creating a Holy Spirit, and purifying them.”⁴⁸⁴

The Ezekiel 36 tradition leads us to the baptism of John in the synoptics and Josephus. As regards John’s baptism, there are a number of scholars who see Ezek 26:25-27 (and Isa 1:16-17) as the prophetic-apocalyptic backdrop necessary for its intelligibility.⁴⁸⁵ Our four features of Ezekiel 36 can be clearly discerned in the synoptic witness. Mark identifies John’s ablutions with a “baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins” in view of the imminent arrival of one who will baptise with the

⁴⁸¹ Greenfield, *et al*, *Aramaic*, 128.

⁴⁸² For Aramaic and Rabbinic developments of the Ezekiel 36 tradition, see Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 123-4, 129-31.

⁴⁸³ Translation from J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Lovanii: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1989), 5.

⁴⁸⁴ Philip, *Origins*, 82.

⁴⁸⁵ Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2007), 139; eadem, “Origin,” 35-57; Joan Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 139-40; F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 84.

Holy Spirit (1:8).⁴⁸⁶ The Markan Gospel ascribes the location of John as a substantiation of Isaiah 40:3 (perhaps conflated with Exod 23:20) in 1:2-4, serving as a wilderness stage for the enactment of traditions that spoke of Elijah's return to avert the wrath of God and to lead Israel to repentance (cf. Mal 4:5; Sir 48:9-10).⁴⁸⁷ John's baptism can therefore be appropriated within a trajectory of Jewish washings for theophanies, that is, ritual bathings that were applicable to the general population in preparation for a future yet imminent divine encounter (e.g. Exod 19:10-15).⁴⁸⁸ John's pronouncement of one who is coming who will baptise with the Holy Spirit or the Spirit of Holiness (Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16) immediately associates his ritual washing with the pneumatic activity of the expected figure.⁴⁸⁹

Furthermore, the locative parallel between John's baptism and the dramatic crossing of the Jordan River under the leadership of Joshua in effect summoned all Israel to prepare for the divine judgment that was approaching.⁴⁹⁰ Regardless of whether the baptism of John was an initiation rite or not,⁴⁹¹ in administering a baptism that mediated the forgiveness of sins by God, John's baptising ministry could not have but created a distinction between two groups of people: those who were ritually prepared for the

⁴⁸⁶ Morna D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 9.

⁴⁸⁷ While the relationship of John's baptism to the ablutions of Qumran has interested scholars, it is unlikely that John viewed sin as ritually defiling and equally unlikely that his baptism functioned to cleanse individuals from ritual impurity, which alone separates John's ablutions from those at Qumran. Cf. Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 141; Joan Taylor *The Immerser*, 15-48. Both Klawans and Taylor observe that the common theological reference to Isa 40:3 by the gospel accounts and Qumran (1QS) is differentiated by both the sources of the text (the gospels prefer the Septuagint while the Community Rule's version accords with the Masoretic text) and hermeneutical emphasis. Instead, it appears that John's baptism drew from both the penitential and prophetic imagery of water purification metaphorically illustrating God's promise to effect atonement (cf. Ps 51:7-9; Ez 36:16-22). See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 141-3; Webb, *John the Baptiser*, 351; Taylor, *The Immerser*, 48.

⁴⁸⁸ Lawrence, *Washing*, 26.

⁴⁸⁹ Webb, *John*, 289.

⁴⁹⁰ Craig Evans "The Baptism of John in a Typological Context," in *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. by Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, JSNTSS 234 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 52.

⁴⁹¹ Webb, *John*, 215, and Hartman, "Baptism," 584, affirm that John's baptism was an initiation, while Christiansen, *The Covenant*, 192-200, and Taylor, *The Immerser*, 69, do not. Both Christiansen and Taylor, however, reject attributing initiation significance to John's baptism because there was no entrance into a community. It should be noted, however, that G. Weckman has made the distinction between being initiated into a community versus initiation into an *office* such as a priest or shaman which does not necessarily entail a corporately-shared status. See George Weckman, "Understanding Initiation," *History of Religions*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Aug., 1970): 62-79; esp. 76-79.

coming of God and those who were not.⁴⁹² The baptism is, in parallel with Ezek 36:25-27, a corporate baptism, a cleansing of a people purified by and for God.

Finally, in addition to the pneumatic, temporal, and communal frames of reference, there is a strong emphasis on repentance and ethical transformation associated with John's baptism, particularly evident in Josephus' description of John's ritual activity (*Ant.* 18.116-119). Josephus indicates that John's baptism called for the Jews to "exercise virtue" (18.117, *κελεύοντα ἀρετήν*) with "righteousness to one another and piety toward God" (18.117, *πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεία*), such that their bodies would be purified by the washing and their souls "thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness" (18.117, *τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκεκαθαρμένης*). Taylor asserts that a fundamental difference exists between John's baptism and other Jewish immersion rites: "In these texts [citing *Sibylline Oracles* 4.162-70 and the Adam and Eve Jordan River narrative in the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses* 29:11-13], there is no suggestion that immersion is not worthwhile until a person has repented and borne good fruit.... In John's practice, repentance does not take place at the same time as the immersion, making it a 'repentance-baptism'; rather, the inner cleansing precedes the outer cleansing. Without inner cleansing, the outer cleansing is completely useless."⁴⁹³ In line with some of the passages surveyed above, John's baptism and the repentance that accompanies it are preparatory for the eschatological arrival of the Spirit.

The foregoing survey of texts demonstrates a considerable degree of conceptual association between time, washing/ purity and the Spirit, community and ethics, which contributed to the prophetic-apocalyptic milieu for Paul's conception of the arrival of the Spirit. I shall now examine Paul's pneumatology in general in light of Ezek 36:25-27, and then investigate Paul's baptism references in particular in light of that pneumatology.

5.6. Paul and Ezekiel 36:25-27

Several scholars are convinced that Paul's understanding of the Spirit currently experienced by the Corinthians is inextricably linked to his conviction that the promise of Ezek 36:25-27 has been fulfilled in the Christ-event.⁴⁹⁴ Fee's massive study of Paul's

⁴⁹² Webb, *John*, 197.

⁴⁹³ *The Immerser*, 92.

⁴⁹⁴ See, e.g., Scott J. Hafemann, *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit: Paul's Defense of His Ministry in II Corinthians 2:14-3:3* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 198, 210-20, 225, 229); idem, *Paul*, *passim*;

pneumatology makes the claim: “Absolutely central to Paul’s theology of the Spirit is that the Spirit is the fulfillment of the promises found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.”⁴⁹⁵ As these studies suggest, the most compelling passage where the promises of Jeremiah and Ezekiel appear as the background texts is 2 Cor 3:3-6. Paul’s description of the gift of the “Spirit of the living God” (πνεῦμα θεοῦ ζῶντος, cf. 1 Cor 6:11) οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ’ ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις parallels Ezek 36:26 (cf. Ezek 11:19) where God promises “the removal of the heart of stone and the giving of a heart of flesh” by the agency of his own Spirit (καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν καρδίαν σαρκίνην καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν). Paul’s reference to the ‘Spirit of the living God’ (πνεῦμα θεοῦ ζῶντος) in 2 Cor 3:3 echoes Ezekiel’s promise that this Spirit that will be poured out into human hearts is God’s own: καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν καρδίαν σαρκίνην καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν (Ezek 36:27).⁴⁹⁶ Paul’s references to the καινὴ διαθήκη in 3:6 not only echoes Jer 31:31-34, but also the promise of an ‘everlasting covenant’ (διαθήκη αἰώνιος) in Ezek 37:26.⁴⁹⁷ And Paul’s conceptual linking of his identity as a minister of a new covenant (καινῆς διαθήκης) with his reference to ‘life-giving Spirit’ (πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ) in 3:6 is taken as a combination of Jer 31:31-34 and Ezek 36:25-27.⁴⁹⁸ Hays concludes that “the Ezekiel text, though present only allusively, is the pivotal point of the contrast between old and new.”⁴⁹⁹

Thus, Paul’s understanding of the Spirit currently experienced by the Corinthians (2:10-14; 3:16; 6:11; 12:3, 7-13; cf. 2 Cor 3:8) is inextricably linked to his conviction that the new covenant promised in Ezek 36:25-27/ Jer 31:31-34 has been fulfilled in Christ (11:25; 2 Cor 3:6).⁵⁰⁰ For as Paul makes clear, the new covenant tradition he delivered to the Corinthians that is celebrated in the ritual meal was “received from the Lord” (1 Cor 11:23), the very Christ who called him to be a “servant of the new covenant” (2 Cor 3:6). As a result, the Corinthians who have been ‘washed’, ‘sanctified’, and ‘justified’ in Christ

Philip, *Origins*; Levison, *Filled*; Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul’s Letters and Thought*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 119 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 21, 23, 112-21; John W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* (WUNT II 251; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008), *passim*; Carol K. Stockhausen, *Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1-4,6* (AnBib 116. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989), *passim*.

⁴⁹⁵ Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 6.

⁴⁹⁶ Yates, *Spirit*, 109.

⁴⁹⁷ Hafemann, *Paul*, 148.

⁴⁹⁸ Hafemann, *Paul*, 148,

⁴⁹⁹ *Echoes*, 129.

⁵⁰⁰ Hafemann, “Temple,” 30.

and the Spirit are already participating in the kingdom of God (1 Cor 6:9-11) and ‘end of the ages’ (1 Cor 10:11). And in as much as the gift of the Spirit as defined by Ezek 36:25-27/ Jer 31:31-34 promises that God’s people will “walk in his statutes and observe his ordinances,” his law “written on their hearts,” Paul can root his ethical imperatives in the indicative of the presence of the Spirit in the lives of the Corinthians (1 Cor 2:2-16; 3:16; 6:11, 19; 9:11; 12:13), expecting them to become πνευματικοί (cf. 3:1). And because for both Jeremiah and Ezekiel the covenant promise entails the establishment of an everlasting relationship with God and his people, one in which God will forever dwell in their midst (Jer 31:34; Ezek 37:26ff), Paul can see the communal presence of the Holy Spirit constituting the Corinthians as ‘God’s temple’ (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 11:27-32; 2 Cor 5:10; 13:2-5; cf. the ‘eternal covenant’ in 1QS V 5-7; the ‘foundation of the holy of holies’ in 1QS VIII 5-9; the ‘holy house’ in 1QS IX 3-6). Because of the holiness of this corporate temple, the Corinthians are to embody within themselves an ethical life characteristic of the new covenant age. Thus, Hubbard writes: “For Paul ... Ezekiel’s ‘new Spirit’ – ‘the promised Spirit’, the ‘Spirit of life’ – was operative in the present...”⁵⁰¹ This apocalyptic, two-age eschatology that surrounds the revelation of the Spirit is summarized by Hafemann:

The *old covenant* is no longer the locus of the revelation of God’s glory in the world; the new covenant of the new age has arrived. And as the prophets promised, the cross of Christ reveals, and the pouring out of the Spirit through Paul’s apostolic ministry confirms, God’s purpose in the new covenant is no longer to reveal his glory in the judgment of death, as in the old covenant, but in the life of the Spirit.⁵⁰²

Against the backdrop of metaphoric predication, the question before us now is whether Paul sees the baptism ritual as the substantiation or materialisation of the divine promise recorded in Ezekiel 36 and thus its fulfillment in time and space. What we shall do is examine 1 Cor 6:11 and 12:13 in light of the four features constitutive of Ezek 36:25-27 to determine the extent to which Paul associated baptism with the pneumatic promise of Ezekiel 36.

First, in terms of the relationship between ritual cleansing and the Spirit, Ezek 36:25-27 LXX combines the verb ραίνω with the phrase ὕδωρ καθάρων to create a motif of

⁵⁰¹ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 122.

⁵⁰² Hafemann, *Paul*, 324.

‘water cleansing’ which points forward to a time when God will put his Spirit in his people (τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν, 36:27). The verb ῥαίνω is used throughout the LXX to denote an *action* of sprinkling or pouring of blood or water which, in Ezekiel’s usage, has the effect of ‘cleansing’ (καθαρίζω) the people of God (cf. Exod. 29:21; Lev. 4:17; 5:9; 8:11; 14:16, 27; 16:14f, 19; Num. 19:4; Isa. 45:8).⁵⁰³ The semantic connotation of ritual purity resulting from the combination of ῥαίνω and καθαρίζω with ὕδωρ καθαρὸν is therefore in very close proximity to Paul’s use of ἀπολούω in relation to ἀγιάζω for the baptism ritual in 1 Cor 6:11. As A.K. Petersen observes, the washing ritual in 6:11 “is said to have cleansed the ritual participants from the state of being that existed prior to the ritual... they have been transferred from a state of impurity to a state of purity.”⁵⁰⁴ Further, the reference to God pouring out his own Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα μου) in Ezek 36:27 is paralleled by Paul’s reference to πνεῦμα θεοῦ in 1 Cor 6:11. The fact that Paul is speaking accounts for the change from first-person in Ezek 36:27 to third-person in 6:11.

Similarly, the use of the verb ποτίζειν in 1 Cor 12:13c may find its rationale within the network of associations constituting Ezekiel 36. We saw above that Paul’s unique phrase πάντες ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν in 12:13c has been translated in terms of irrigation or hydration, such as ‘made to drink’, ‘watered’, etc. Paul’s usage of ποτίζειν evidences that the choice between translating the term ‘made to drink’ (cf. πίνω) or ‘watered’ is a false antithesis. In 3:2 the term is used to refer to the giving of drink to humans while 3:6-8 refers to Apollos’ ‘watering’ what Paul has planted, which, again, refers metaphorically to humans. We may find a middle ground by rendering ποτίζειν as ‘hydrated by the Spirit’ (although noting that ἐν πνεύμα is not in the dative case.).⁵⁰⁵ But why use the term ποτίζειν?⁵⁰⁶ The Ezekiel new covenant promise may provide the rationale for Paul’s verb choice, for as a result of his cleansing and indwelling his people, God promises to make their ‘desolate land become like the garden of Eden’ (κῆπος τρυφῆς, Ezek 36:35), which,

⁵⁰³ C.H. Hunzinger, “ῥαντίζω,” *TDNT* VI: 976-984; Horace D. Hummel, *Ezekiel*, 2 Vols. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007), II.1051.

⁵⁰⁴ Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “Rituals of Purification, Rituals of Initiation: Phenomenological, Taxonomical and Culturally Evolutionary Reflections,” in David Hellholm, *et al* (eds), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2011), 3.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. Wolff, *Der erste Brief*, 299; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 591.

⁵⁰⁶ Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 3:218 n.616 notes that the LXX passages that are often cited in support of ποτίζειν modifying βαπτίζειν (e.g. Ez 36:25f; Joel 2:28, etc) do not use the verb ποτίζειν.

according to Gen 2:6, 10 contained a “mist from the earth that watered (ἐπότιζεν) the whole surface of the ground” and a river that “flowed out of Eden to water (ποτίζειν) the garden.” This vision is in fact the whole thrust of Ezekiel 36, where vv. 28-38 is “a virtual return to the garden scene of Genesis 2.”⁵⁰⁷ If this is Paul’s allusion, he may in fact be anticipating his Adam theology in 1 Cor 15:20-28, which, interestingly, is followed by two baptism allusions in Paul’s highly cryptic and passing reference to ‘baptism on behalf of the dead’ in v. 29.

Secondly, as regards the eschatological frame of reference, we have already seen how Paul’s view of baptism in Gal 3:26-29 and 1 Cor 6:11 entails a unique conception of time, constituting an apocalyptic ritual that reveals the dawning of the messianic age. His reference to baptism in 1 Cor 12:13 is no different. Paul begins 1 Corinthians 12 by reminding the Corinthians of the *time* when (ὅτε) they *were* Gentiles (ἔθνη ἦτε), they *were* led astray by mute idols (πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα ... ἤγεσθε) (12:2). However, the Corinthians were through the Spirit all baptised into the body of Christ (12:13) which *is* one body with many members (τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει) (12:12). Paul’s sense of pneumatic time represents in effect an inversion of the ritual washings at Qumran, where the ablutions take place prior to and in expectation of the messianic deliverance. In stark contrast to Qumran, baptism was interpreted by Paul as an apocalyptic ritual through which the time of the age of the Spirit promised by Ezekiel had in fact broken into the world, incorporating its participants (both Jew and Gentile) into the transformative death and resurrection of Christ (cf. Rom 6:1-11; Gal 1:1-5), thus forming ritually a people in the midst of whom the presence of God may dwell (Ezek 37:24b-28). The performance of the baptism ritual was therefore an unambiguous attestation for Paul that the age to come has now become a reality among the Galatians and Corinthians in their present experience of the risen Christ through the Spirit.

Thirdly, in terms of the ethical frame of reference, we have already seen a consistent concern for ethical identity specific to the baptism ritual in 1 Cor 1:10-17 and 6:9-11. We may add to these observations verbal parallels which involve that from which the people of God are cleansed. Ezekiel’s promise, as part of the salvation oracle in 36:16-38, is in response to Israel’s defilement with idols. God promises to sprinkle clean water upon his

⁵⁰⁷ Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning*, 96.

people to cleanse them and purify them from the contamination of their idolatry (εἰδωλον in Ezek 36:25; cf. 6:4, 6, 13; 8:10; 16:16; 18:12; 23:39; 36:17; etc).⁵⁰⁸ Similarly, in 1 Cor 6:9-11, Paul sees the Corinthians' washing in terms of their cleansing from their unrighteous lives (οἱ ἄδικοι; cf. ἄδικοι Ezek 33:15) which included (or perhaps better were dominated by) idolatrous practices (εἰδωλολάτραι, 6:9). An idolatry motif appears as well in proximity to the baptism of 1 Cor 12:13, which is referenced against the backdrop of their former lives as unbelieving ἔθνη when they were 'led astray by mute idols' (τὰ εἰδωλα, τὰ ἄφωνα, 12:2). In both passages, the ritual washing is presented as a cleansing from their idolatrous past (cf., too, Ezekiel's concern over sexual immorality such as intercourse with a neighbour's wife (18:6, 11, 15; 33:26) and incest (22:11) with Paul's concerns in 1 Cor 5:1-13).⁵⁰⁹

Moreover, the promise of Ezekiel which entails that God's Spirit-endowed people will walk in his statutes or righteousness (δικαίωμα) is paralleled with the fact that the Corinthians have been declared 'justified' (δικαιόω) in 6:11.⁵¹⁰ The clear ethical emphasis in 6:9-11 observed above echoes the fact that Ezekiel promises that the reception of the divine Spirit will enable God's people to observe or keep his judgments or ordinances (τὰ κρίματά μου) in 36:27. The Corinthians, having been 'washed' and 'justified' in their baptisms, are now in a position to judge (κρίνειν) their own affairs as a proleptic manifestation of their future role as judges of the cosmos (6:1-2). Hence, to have κρίματα or lawsuits at all among themselves is already a defeat for them. In contrast to the promise of Ezekiel 36, this kind of behaviour will not inherit the kingdom of God (vv. 9-10).

Fourthly, as regards the corporate frame of reference, the experience of the Spirit that dominates 1 Cor 12:12-27 is constituted by a *corporate* or *communal* pneumatic

⁵⁰⁸ Crane notes that the Septuagint's addition of καὶ in Ezek 36:25 means that the cleansing from their uncleanness and idols is inextricably linked back to the sprinkling of clean water at the front of the verse. See Ashley S. Crane, *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum Vol. 122; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 77; Cf. Ka Leung Wong, *Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 151.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. Mein, *Ezekiel*, 150-1.

⁵¹⁰ Yates, *Spirit*, 144 n.3, notes that the noun δικαίωμα is rarely used by Paul, occurring only in Romans at 1:32; 2:26; 5:16, 18; and 8:4. It occurs in the plural at 2:26 where it appears to mean the ordinances of the law as a whole, while the remaining singular uses all appear to have different meanings. In Rom 5:16 and 18, the context appears to connote 'justification' in v. 16 and 'act of righteousness' in v. 18.

experience, which parallels the second-person plural used throughout Ez 36:25-27.⁵¹¹ Foregrounding Ezekiel 36, we can see that against the backdrop of their former lives as unbelieving ἔθνη, ‘led astray by mute idols’ (12:2), the Corinthians’ pneumatic confession ‘Jesus is Lord’ in 12:3 blossoms forth a series of ‘gifts’, ‘ministries’, and ‘effects’ that constitute together a super-individual, intra-subjective, allo-communicative experience of the Spirit grounded in their baptisms (12:4-6, 13). For, in the context of 1 Corinthians 12-14, the Spirit does not manifest itself in mere private experience or ecstatic utterance for that matter, but rather first and foremost ‘for the common good’ (12:7), in the *sharing* of ‘wisdom’, in a ‘word of knowledge’, in ‘faith’, and ‘gifts of healing’ and the ‘effecting of miracles’ (vv. 8-10). And, particularly relevant for 1 Corinthians 12-14 as a unit, it is in this context of a pneumatically shared lifeworld that the Corinthians are to appropriate their ecstatic speech for the benefit of all (v. 10).

As developed in 1 Corinthians 12, this corporate, intra-subjective experience of the Spirit transforms into a motif of the body politic which serves as the dominant metaphor for the church (cf. Romans 12:4-5). Through the ritual washing, every body in turn transforms into ‘members’ (μέλη; 1 Cor 12:12; 12:14, 18, 19, 20) of the intra-subjective ‘body of Christ’ (12:27) that are physiognomically linked together in such a way that “If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it” (12:26). The ritual connection between washing, Spirit and community appears to provide that complex of associations through which the body of the initiate can be identified with the sacred and thus participate in the characteristic attribute of the pneumatic community. The initiate would not merely have claimed to have experienced the Spirit inherent in the community; the water washing, by virtue of its ability to conjoin disparate phenomena into a totalising ritualised cosmos, would have enabled the initiate palpably and publicly to *commune* with the Spirit, predicating a new social status and therefore a new identity upon the initiate. As such, Paul’s view of the baptism rite is one in which the body of the initiate is revealed as a microcosmic replication, a representation, of the eschatological drama that defined the identity of the community.

Thus, the fact that Paul’s pneumatology centers on the fulfillment of the promise of Ezek 36:25-27 in Christ and the ongoing presence of the Spirit on the one hand, and that

⁵¹¹ *Filled*, 207.

his baptism references involve pneumatic, temporal, ethical and communal frames of reference comparable to those constitutive of Ezek 36:25-27 on the other, means that the baptism ritual for Paul was in fact the reconstitution of space and time around the fulfillment of the Ezekiel 36 promise. This observation further refines our understanding of baptism as an apocalyptic ritual: for Paul, baptism revealed the dawning of the messianic age by fulfilling the promise of Ezek 36:25-27 through the bodies of the baptised. In terms of metaphoric predication, the ritual washing was understood by Paul to be an index of the presence of the Spirit manifested in the confession of Christ's Lordship over the baptised (cf. 12:3) and thus a palpable substantial revelation of the establishment of the Ezekiel promise of the Spirit in Christ. We therefore have an integral ritual theoretical explanation for the relationship between the Spirit and the baptism ritual. Rather than a material Spirit communicated through the conjoining with water, Paul envisions a πνεῦμα not of this world, a πνεῦμα that is in fact 'holy', set apart from this 'present evil age' at the very same time that it breaks into and rescues its recipients from that age. The baptismally-revealed Spirit thus provides the ethical renewal that Ezekiel's promise requires, revealed through the bodies of believers in their pneumatic confession of Christ's Lordship over their lives and fostered in a new shared lifeworld of mutuality and fellowship centered on Christ. And rather than a merely metaphorical washing of the Spirit, we have in baptism what Fernandez calls a 'ceremonial scene' or 'sign-image'; that is, metaphors of divine washing and Spirit-gifting transform palpably into ritual acts and utterances that reconstitute time and space around and through ritual participants who are thus identified with those metaphors. Thus, for Paul, the dawning of the Ezekiel-promised Spirit was in fact revealed as a present reality in the temporal, ethical and social frames of reference constitutive of the baptism ritual.

5.7. Summary and Conclusions

Turning to 1 Cor 12:13, we found that the two major points of interpretive contention surround the relationship between πνεῦμα and βαπτίζεῖν in 12:13a and βαπτίζεῖν and ποτίζειν in 12:13c respectively. As regards the relationship between πνεῦμα and βαπτίζεῖν, we found that the two lines of interpretation represented, the *sacramental* view and the *symbolic* view, are in fact false dichotomies if metaphoric conceptions are

understood in terms of anthropology and ritual theory. As regards the proposals for the relationship between ποτίζειν and βαπτίζειν in 12:13c, we found interpretations that appropriate ποτίζειν as a reference to the Lord's Supper lacking in exegetical and historical plausibility, and we rejected the logic that a metaphoric modification of a verb requires that the modified verb itself be a metaphor.

We then explained the relationship between the three terms, πνεῦμα, βαπτίζειν and ποτίζειν in terms of 'metaphoric predication', which argues that in order for one to be identified ritually with a metaphor (e.g. 'the body of Christ'), one must participate in a series of ceremonial scenes or sign images that extend from the metaphor. We found that through the formation of ritualised bodies, abstract concepts are made substantial and thus comprehensible, being experienced by the ritual participant as something inseparable from his or her self, since nothing is experienced more immediately than one's own body. By participating in rituals that are associated with the metaphor, the metaphor becomes fused inseparably with the participant.

In light of our ritual theory, we then found that the terms βαπτίζειν and ποτίζειν in relation to the Spirit reflect a Jewish metaphoric conception of a future 'outpouring' of the Spirit that abounds in biblical and post-biblical literature centered on the promise of Ezek 36:25-27. We in turn observed the formative role Ezekiel 36 plays in Paul's pneumatology, and then examined his references to baptism in light of four frames of reference specific to Ezek 36:25-27: time, Spirit, community and ethics. We found that for Paul the ritual medium of 'washing' and the presence of the Spirit, particularly in the pneumatic utterance of Christ's Lordship (12:3), conjoined in his understanding of the dawning of the Ezekiel 36 new covenant in the coming of Christ. Through the reconstitution of space and time around the ritualised bodies of believers, the arrival of the Spirit, the central characteristic of the messianic age, had in fact been revealed. As a result, the body of the initiate was revealed as a microcosmic replication, a representation, of the eschatological narrative that defined the identity of the community. Believers, together as a single pneumatic body united in Christ, were already participating in the kingdom of God (6:9-11) and the 'end of the ages' (10:11). Thus, the Corinthians were to embody within themselves an ethical life characteristic of the new covenant age, an embodiment that Paul locates as beginning with their 'washing ... in the

Spirit of our God' in 1 Cor 6:11 and their baptism 'by one Spirit' in 12:13. Through the application of ritual theory, we were therefore able to see more precisely how the baptism ritual forged temporal, ethical and communal identity into a revelation of the dawning of the messianic age.

Paul and Ritual Washings: Conclusions

Having surveyed baptism in a number of passages in Galatians and 1 Corinthians, we are now in a position to summarise our conclusions. There are four interrelated features to Pauline baptism:

First, we found that the Pauline conception of baptism was an apocalyptic ritual that revealed the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the baptised. As a revelation of the messianic age, baptism involved two dialectically related features: (i) faith in Christ and (ii) the demarcation of time. In terms of faith in Christ, we found that πίστις and βαπτίζειν were irreducible to one another in Gal 3:26-29. Christian baptism was *Christian* by virtue of the unique feature of proclaiming the Lordship of Christ over the ritual participant. However, we noted as well that it was the baptism ritual that transformed private belief into public acceptance. We found that the primary mechanism by which Christ-faith was objectivised as public acceptance was the distinctly *temporal* nature of baptism. Because of the inherent periodicity of ritualised activity, baptism was able to communicate through the bodies of the baptised a highly visible unambiguous temporal demarcation between the ‘present evil age’ (Gal 1:4) and the ‘new creation’ (Gal 6:15). Thus, Paul was able to appeal to a *point in time* in the past (the aorist ἐβαπτίσθητε, Gal 3:27) as the foundation for their *current* status as ‘sons of God’ (Gal 3:26). Similarly, the sins characteristic of the *past* identity of some of the Corinthians (1 Cor 6:9-10) found terminus in their sanctification and justification, namely *when* they were ‘washed’ (cf. the aorist ἀπελούσασθε, 1 Cor 6:11). Against the backdrop of Jewish apocalypticism, which emphasised a distinct conception of periodicity involving the ‘last days’, the performance of baptism generated a spatio-temporal dualism of ‘this world’ and ‘the world to come’/ ‘the new creation’ located in the space of the baptised body. Thus, we concluded that baptism for Paul revealed somatically the dawning of the messianic age in the death and resurrection of Christ.

Secondly, baptism revealed the dawning of the messianic age *performatively*, that is, baptism entailed what it revealed; it generated what it communicated through the very act of communication. We found that Christian baptism was without parallel or precedent in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds. No other ritual washing involved the performative

frames of reference specific to Christian baptism, such as the practice of baptising into the name of someone, baptism at the hands of another, its association with the gift of the Spirit and the distinctly non-recurrent characteristic of the ritual washing. Being without any washing parallel or precedent, there was no rationale for Christian baptism in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds, and therefore Christian baptism bore witness to another world. Baptism was thus effective performatively in revealing through the baptised body a world not of this one.

Thirdly, because baptism revealed the dawning of the messianic age through a ritualised body, baptism obligated the participant to live out a concomitantly apocalyptic life. We found that the efficacy of ritualised performatives was dependent upon the mechanisms of embodiment. Specifically, rituals were effective in accomplishing their goals only to the extent that the ritualised body demonstrated an *acceptance of* and thus an *obligation to* the social arrangements, practices and power relations specific to the ritualised processes. Hence, Paul understood the *ethical* identity of believers as inextricably linked to their baptisms. This link was particularly evident in 1 Corinthians, where we noted that the characteristically Pauline indicative and imperative combination had a ritual rationale. Since acceptance entails obligation, baptism did not *fulfill* the believer's obligation toward Christ but in fact *established* that obligation. Paul could thus appeal to the acceptance of a shared identity with Christ embodied in baptism as the basis for moral and covenantal fidelity on the part of the baptised (1 Cor 6:9-11). However, because of the distinctly apocalyptic nature of baptism, the believer was obliged to live a concomitantly apocalyptic life, one that embodied the reconstitution of the values of the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds around the uniqueness of the Christ-event. As we found in Gal 3:26-29 and 1 Cor 1:10-17, the failure to embody a Christ-centered ethical life risked subsuming baptism to Jewish or Graeco-Roman value-norms which did nothing less than compromise the apocalyptic integrity of the baptism ritual. Such a compromise thereby reconstituted practically the world in accordance with pre-messianic social conditions and was thus in effect a denial of the sufficiency of the cross to usher in the messianic age.

Fourthly, because the gift of the Spirit was at the centre of the revelation of the messianic age, baptism provided the pneumatic means by which the baptised were able to

fulfill their ethical obligations. We found that baptism for Paul involved the ritualised fulfillment of Ezek 36:25-27 (1 Cor 6:11; 12:13). Specifically, baptism was for Paul a ritualised mechanism, which we designated as metaphoric predication, by which the irreducibly communal manifestation of the Spirit as promised by Ezekiel was communicated palpably and tangibly to the believer. Because baptism signaled unambiguously to the participants that they have in fact been incorporated into a corporate, intra-subjective manifestation of the eschatological Spirit, the baptised were empowered pneumatically to fulfill their ethical obligation to live a life specific to the norms of the messianic age. Thus, Pauline baptism revealed the dawning of the messianic age by fulfilling the promise of Ezek 36:25-27 through encoding the eschatological, communal and ethical frames of reference specific to that pneumatic promise in the ritualised bodies of the baptised.

Part III

Paul and Ritual Meals

The Antiochene Meals: Embodying the ‘Truth of the Gospel’

7.1. Introduction

In Gal 2:11-14, Paul recounts an episode at Antioch involving the controversy surrounding Jew-Gentile table fellowship. Paul describes how the apostle Peter⁵¹² and the other Jewish Christians in the mixed congregation of Antioch⁵¹³ regularly ate meals together (συνεσθίω, 2:12a), a practice that extended from their agreement at the so-called ‘Jerusalem council’ that recognized the unifying nature of the gospel for the circumcised and uncircumcised alike (2:1-9). However, this tolerant attitude towards Gentile believers changed after the arrival at Antioch of ‘certain men from James’ (τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, 2:12a),⁵¹⁴ who appear to have intimidated Peter and the other Jewish Christians (οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, 2:13a)⁵¹⁵ into withdrawing from table fellowship with the Gentiles, ‘fearing those from circumcision’ (φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, 2:12b).⁵¹⁶ The result was a disruption of the unity of the gospel by socially pressuring Gentile Christians to adopt

⁵¹² That Κηφῶς is the Aramaic counterpart to the Greek name Πέτρος (cf. 1:18; 2:9, 11 with 2:7-8), see Betz, *Galatians*, 76-77; Bruce, *Galatians*, 120-121; Ezra Hon-seng Kok, *The Truth of the Gospel: A Study in Galatians 2:15-21* (Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2000), 61-62.

⁵¹³ For an overview of Antioch-on-the-Orontes, see Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A social-scientific approach to the separation between Judaism and Christianity* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 18-52; Betz, *Galatians*, 104-105. On Jewish and Christian communities in Antioch, see Markus Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 56-61; Stephen Anthony Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom in Galatians 1 and 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 138-60.

⁵¹⁴ The plural textual variant τινάς is favored over the singular τινά (P⁴⁶) by UBS⁴ and NA²⁶; so, too, Longenecker, *Galatians*, 116; Bruce, *Galatians*, 129-30; Kok, *Truth*, 63 n.50. The question as to the identity of these men involves their relationship to James which is itself contingent on whether ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου modifies the noun τινάς or the verb ἐλθεῖν. If it is the former, then James is the leader (Betz, *Galatians* 108; Riddersbos, *Galatians*, 96); if the latter, then James is the sender (Fung, *Galatians*, 107; Schlier, *Galatians*, 83).

⁵¹⁵ There is little to suggest that οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι in 2:13a refers to anything other than Jewish Christ-believers (see, e.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 110 n.473; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 75; Bruce, *Galatians*, 131).

⁵¹⁶ The identity of οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς is generally considered distinct from the τινάς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου in 2:12a. What appears clear is that they are Jews, perhaps including Christ-believers, who continue to define Jewish fidelity in terms of classic Jewish practices such as circumcision. See, e.g., Martyn, *Galatians*, 236-40; Dunn, *Jesus*, 171 n.113; Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 133; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 73-5; Bruce, *Galatians*, 131; Fung, *Galatians*, 108. For a proposal on the ‘party of the circumcision’ as the ‘party for circumcision’ (an intra-Jewish group characterized by a zeal for the application of circumcision), see Mark D. Nanos ‘What was at Stake in Peter’s “Eating with the Gentiles” at Antioch?’ in idem (ed.), *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* (Peabody: Hedrickson Publishers, 2002), 285f.

practices indicative of a specifically Jewish identity in order to be accepted back into table-fellowship.

The relevance of the Antioch incident for the Galatians is that Peter's actions, like the actions of the Galatians, threatened the 'truth of the gospel' (ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, cf. 1:11; 2:2, 5, 7, 14).⁵¹⁷ Peter's withdrawal from Gentile table-fellowship serves as the formal occasion for Paul's argument in 2:15-21, which is perhaps a summary of what he said to Peter at Antioch.⁵¹⁸ However, that the content of Paul's argument in 2:15-21 applies to the Galatians materially (in terms of how they are turning away from the gospel) is demonstrated by the recurrence and development of key terms and concepts in 2:15-21 throughout the letter.⁵¹⁹ Betz's 1979 rhetorical study of Galatians accounted for such a development by understanding 2:15-21 as the *propositio* of the letter. In ancient rhetoric, a *propositio* "(1) identifies points that all parties agree upon, (2) identifies points that all parties do not agree upon, and (3) is marked out by conciseness and brevity, in order to be unpacked in more detail later."⁵²⁰ While not necessarily adopting Betz's rhetorical analysis, most commentators acknowledge that 2:15-21 is a passage that presents "the larger argument of the letter in a highly condensed form, as a sort of preview to the thought he is about to develop."⁵²¹ Gal 2:16 in particular entails terminological and conceptual indicators that are developed throughout the epistle. For example, R. Hays observes, there "is a sense in which all of Galatians 3 and 4 can be read as Paul's 'exegesis' of the concise authoritative formulations of 2:16."⁵²²

⁵¹⁷ In terms of the relationship between Antioch and Galatia, Dunn, *Galatians*, 14, comments: "...the crisis in Galatia was probably caused by the arrival in the Galatian churches of a group equivalent to the 'men from James' (2:12), anxious to press home their success at Antioch and to establish the Jewish way of life ('judaizing' – 2:14) as the norm for all churches founded as a result of the expansion from Antioch." For a discussion treating the multiple perplexities surrounding the issues of the relationship between Antioch and Galatia, see Kok, *Truth*, 61-88.

⁵¹⁸ "It is generally accepted that Paul here [in 2:15-21] restates the position he argued for at Antioch in the confrontation with Peter" (Dunn, *Galatians*, 132). So, too, Kok, *Truth*, 54-55; Fung, *Galatians*, 105; Seifrid, "Paul," 216-7. The "majority" view basically argues that the thought of verse 14b is incomplete without the explanation of 2:15f.

⁵¹⁹ "Indeed, it is at this point in the letter that Paul introduces 'justification' as a *Leitmotiv* which continues until the conclusion of the body of the letter" (Seifrid, "Paul," 215).

⁵²⁰ Bruce W. Longenecker. "Defining the Faithful Character of the Covenant Community: Galatians 2:15-21 and Beyond," in J.D.G. Dunn (ed.), *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 75-97, 79; Betz, *Galatians*, 114.

⁵²¹ Seifrid, "Paul," 215; Hays, *Faith*, 123. Most disagreements with Betz's analysis of 2:15-21 stem from his insistence on separating 2:15-21 from any direct relationship to 2:11-14. See the alternative proposal for understanding 2:15-21 as part of the *Narratio* in Lyons, *Pauline*, 135; cf. Kok, *Truth*, 55-6.

⁵²² Hays, *Faith*, 123.

There are two major issues contested by scholars surrounding the content of Gal 2:11-21. First, there is the question as to the extent to which Jewish food prescriptions were being observed at Antiochene rituals of commensality and how such observance related to the concerns of the ‘men from James’ and the ‘circumcision party’ that so adversely affected Peter and his fellow Jewish Christ-believers. Secondly, there is controversy over the meaning of the densely-packed argumentation in Gal 2:15-21, particularly involving the significance of the terms ἔργα νόμου, δικαιόω and πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2:16 and their relation to the Antiochene meals. I shall begin with an overview of the state of the question as to the nature of the mixed table-fellowship at Antioch followed by a distinctly ritual reading of 2:11-14. I shall argue that the meals at Antioch, as embodiments of the ‘truth of the gospel’, did in fact involve a significant deviation from meal norms consistent with faithful Jewish food practices. I shall then examine Paul’s argument in 2:15-21 in light of the conclusions reached in 2:11-14. I will argue that the embodiment indicators in 2:11-14 do in fact continue into 2:15-21 and thus inform our understanding of the controverted terms ἔργα νόμου, δικαιόω and πίστις Χριστοῦ, and Paul’s wider argument throughout the pericope.

7.2. The Nature of Mixed Table-Fellowship at Antioch: State of the Question

There are two major trajectories of interpretation surrounding the mixed table-fellowship at Antioch: what we shall call the *traditional* interpretation and the *new perspective* interpretation.

The traditional interpretation of the Antiochene incident sees the mixed table-fellowship in which Peter participated as basically disregarding Jewish dietary restrictions. Drawing from the Acts 10 episode, J.B. Lightfoot interprets Peter’s participation in the mixed table-fellowship as in effect treating Jewish food traditions as ‘worthless’ and ‘narrow’: “He [Peter] had no scruples about living ἐθνικῶς.”⁵²³ Burton understands the significance of the shared table-fellowship as involving Peter’s exposing himself “to the liability of eating food forbidden by the O.T. Law of clean and unclean foods (Lev. Chap. 11), and thus in effect declared it not binding upon him.”⁵²⁴ Since the

⁵²³ J.B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), 112.

⁵²⁴ Ernest De Witt Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (New York: Scribner, 1920), 104.

Jerusalem council's decision dealt explicitly only with the matter of circumcision and not food, the men from James may have come out of concern that Peter's actions at Antioch were compromising the integrity of his mission to the Jews ('the circumcision'), which in turn accounts for Peter's 'fear' and withdrawal.⁵²⁵ From this vantage point, the arrival of the men from James would be in accordance with advocating some kind of observance of Jewish food laws on Peter's part, on account of their ministry to 'the circumcision'. Betz, too, follows a similar line of reasoning, arguing that Paul's phrase ἐθνικῶς ζῆς in 2:14b means that Peter, being a Jew, is "no longer in observation of Jewish customs and Law (οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς)."⁵²⁶ Betz explains: "The present tense of ζῆς ('you are living') implies much more than an act of table fellowship with Christian Gentiles. It suggests that the table fellowship was only the external symbol of Cephas' total emancipation from Judaism."⁵²⁷ Betz as well suggests that the concern of the men from James was specific to Peter: "The separation of the mission to the Jews from that to the Gentiles would imply that Peter would retain his Jewish way of life, and that included first of all dietary and purity laws. As a result, cultic separation would have to be observed also during table fellowship with Gentiles Christians. This was especially important in the Diaspora, where defilement was most likely to occur."⁵²⁸

However, since James Dunn's groundbreaking 1983 study, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-18),"⁵²⁹ scholars have increasingly advocated a hypothesis that we shall refer to as the 'new perspective' interpretation, which argues that the basic food laws prescribed by Torah were being followed or respected by Gentile Christians at Antioch. After surveying the spectrum of possibilities for Jewish food practices, ranging from an outright refusal to share any commensality with Gentiles (cf. Tob 1:10-13; Jdt 10:5; 12:1-20) to a welcoming attitude toward mixed table-fellowship, Dunn concludes that the Pauline antithesis between ἐθνικῶς/ Ἰουδαϊκῶς in 2:14b is in fact consistent with a broad range of contrasting practices that could include a 'Noahic lifestyle' and a 'Sinaitic

⁵²⁵ Burton, *Galatians*, 105-6.

⁵²⁶ Betz, *Galatians*, 111-12.

⁵²⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, 112; cf. similarly, Bruce, *Galatians*, 129.

⁵²⁸ Betz, *Galatians*, 108. So, too, Martyn, *Galatians*, 242, who sees the concern by the men of James to be specific to Peter and not the other Jews, since Peter's eating with the Gentiles may have the effect of compromising the integrity of his mission to the circumcision. However, as de Boer's notes, this explanation does not account for the actions of Barnabas and the other Jewish believers (*Galatians*, 135).

⁵²⁹ Now published in James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1990), 183-206.

lifestyle', the former being characteristic of God-fearing Gentiles, the latter of loyal Jews.⁵³⁰ Given that most of the Gentile converts were most likely God-fearers prior to their conversion, Dunn concludes that the Gentile Christians at Antioch were "already observing the *basic food laws* prescribed by Torah," with the men from James demanding a "much more scrupulous observance of the rulings on what the dietary laws involved, especially with regard to ritual purity and tithing."⁵³¹

While scholars have been critical of some of the details in Dunn's historical reconstruction, his basic assertion that the Law was being honoured has been widely accepted.⁵³² E.P. Sanders argues that James was "worried that too much fraternization with Gentiles would have bad results, and that Peter's mission would be discredited if he were known to engage in it himself."⁵³³ M. Bockmuehl notes Josephus' comment in *Bell* 2:479 that Antioch, along with Apamea and Sidon, did not exhibit inter-ethnic violence that characterised so many cities at the beginning of the Jewish revolt in 66 CE. Bockmuehl thus concludes that the evidence may explain why "the impetus for Jewish Christians to dissociate from meal fellowship with Gentiles originated in Jerusalem, and not in the Jewish community of Antioch."⁵³⁴ Cummins, following Bockmuehl, concludes that Jewish Christians at Antioch would have constituted a comparable range of views to that of Diaspora Jews at large. Thus there would have been Christian Jews who were adamant at maintaining their Jewish identity through observing biblical dietary prescriptions and those who were relatively lax with food restrictions. From this perspective, then, the party from James, representing a commitment to maintaining Jewish identity, is interested in correcting the behaviour of *Jewish* Christians. However, there is no indication that *Gentile* Christians were being held accountable to Torah food

⁵³⁰ Dunn, *Jesus*, 148.

⁵³¹ Dunn, *Jesus*, 154.

⁵³² Esler's proposal is an exception to this trend. Esler argues that "as a general rule Jews did refrain from eating with Gentiles and that this was a feature which was perceived to characterize their life-style from as early as the late fourth century BCE until far into the classical period..." Esler's proposal, however, has found few advocates, particularly because he tends to treat ἐθνικῶς (living as a Gentile) and Ἰουδαϊκῶς (living as a Jew) as antitheses, failing to see intermediate possibilities, such as 'God-fearers'. Cf. the critiques in Kok, *Truth*, 70-1; Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 141.

⁵³³ E.P. Sanders, "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14," in Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (eds.), *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (Nashville: Abingdom, 1990), 170-88, 186. Similarly, P.J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Assen/Maastricht/Minneapolis: Can Corcum/Fortress, 1990), 228-9, 236.

⁵³⁴ Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law*, 57.

regulations, especially in light of Gal 2:1-10 that presents James as endorsing the position that Gentiles are under no such obligation.⁵³⁵ Paul's rebuke of Peter indicates that Peter and those following him in withdrawing from table-fellowship had failed to make this distinction and were thus holding Gentile Christians accountable to distinctively Jewish Law, thus questioning their position within the community of Christ-believers.

What is clear from the above proposals is that a major point of disagreement between the 'traditional' and 'new perspective' interpretations is the extent to which the Christ-event impacted Paul's perspective on the Law. The traditional interpretation sees nothing less than a radical recalibration of cosmic and social life around the Christ-event, a reconstitution that includes the Law itself, while the new perspective tends to leave the Law basically intact, with scholars differing over proposed degrees of modification for the inclusion of Gentiles. Ritual theory may provide the frames of reference to adjudicate between these two positions, particularly in relation to the mechanisms of embodiment and their significance for what Paul calls the 'truth of the gospel' (ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 2:14a). I will argue that by reading the 'truth of the gospel' in terms of what Rappaport calls an 'ultimate sacred postulate', the ritualised bodies at Antioch provided necessary mechanisms for the sanctity, the truth, of the gospel proclamation, while the gospel informed reciprocally their ritualised bodies as participants in the Christ-event. The Antiochene meals and the 'truth of the gospel' are thus mutually interpretive. Because the shared meal is integral to the truthfulness of the gospel for its participants, the bodies of the participants are identified with and thus are inseparable from the gospel, representing formative and informative dynamics respectively. I will therefore argue that the defining elements of the Antiochene meals were bound up inextricably with the 'truth of the gospel' itself.

7.3. Ultimate Sacred Postulates and the Mechanisms of Embodiment

From the vantage point of ritual theory, the 'truth of the gospel' can be read as a constituent element of a class of expressions that Rappaport terms 'ultimate sacred postulates'. As I have explored previously with regard to the performative utterance at Corinthian baptisms, ultimate sacred postulates are statements or propositions that

⁵³⁵ Stephen A. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ*, 165-69; so, too, Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law*, 71-3; Zetterholm, *Formation of Christianity*, 129-66.

represent the highest value in the cognised environment of a population. Without any material significata, ultimate sacred postulates are full of meaning but devoid of rational falsification or empirical verification and are thus beyond question, so that, in Rappaport's words: "the unfalsifiable ... yields the unquestionable."⁵³⁶

Rappaport makes an important qualification regarding sanctity; namely, that it is necessarily *postulated*. That is, sanctity is a property that belongs to discourse. Rappaport writes:

Sanctity by this account is a property of religious discourse and *not* of the objects signified in or by that discourse. In this usage it is not Christ, for example, who is sacred, but the liturgical words and acts proclaiming his divinity that are sacred. Christ's divinity, distinct from its stipulation and acceptance, is another matter. Whereas sanctity in my usage is a quality *of discourse itself*, divinity, when it is stipulated, is a putative property of the subject matter asserted *in* that discourse.⁵³⁷

Moreover, ultimate sacred postulates, being devoid of any material significata, are not subject to the processes of the correspondence theory of truth, namely verification and/or falsification. Instead, ultimate sacred postulates, as performatives, *generate* truth. As I have noted previously (see 2.2.), the utterances that transform a prince into a king, dub a knight, or pronounce newlywed status upon the betrothed do not entail statements considered true because they report a previously existing state of affairs; rather, these states of affairs are considered veridical to the degree to which they conform to the ritualised utterances.

But what establishes or grounds the *sanctity* of these postulates? What accounts for their efficacy to generate truth? To answer these questions, Rappaport turns to the Dominican philosopher-theologian Joseph Bochenski's 1965 book, *The Logic of Religion*, who argues that religious discourse is constructed according to a complex or nexus of two logically related factors: what Bochenski calls *heuristic* and *obligatory* mechanisms. Heuristic mechanisms involve various strategies by which certain postulates are set apart in a hierarchical fashion from all other competing truth claims and thus rendered 'unquestionable'. Obligatory mechanisms involve various strategies by which people demonstrate their acceptance of and thus their obligation to such utterances. Bochenski argues that the sacred language constituting creeds or what Rappaport has

⁵³⁶ *Ritual*, 217.

⁵³⁷ *Ritual*, 281.

termed ‘ultimate sacred postulates’ requires such mechanisms for its differentiation from the mundane and common.⁵³⁸ We shall look at each mechanism in turn.

First, the heuristic rules that indicate which sentences qualify as sacred are extra-linguistic mechanisms or strategies by which certain sentences are set-apart in a privileged position to all other utterances or alternative truth claims. As extra-linguistic mechanisms, these heuristic rules are not properties of the sentences themselves but rather provide the form or context by which certain sentences are positioned hierarchically in relation to others (e.g. “All statements in the book of Genesis are to be regarded as sacred”).⁵³⁹ Rappaport argues that ritualised processes provide the mechanisms and strategies that satisfy the criteria for these heuristic rules: “... ritual itself embodies heuristic rules or, better, *liturgical orders constitute heuristic rules*. That is, I am claiming that the recurrent, punctilious and perduring expression of a particular sentence or set of sentences in ritual selects it out of the infinite possibilities of discourse and represents it as an ultimate sacred postulate.”⁵⁴⁰

Secondly, there is what Bochenski calls “the basic Dogma” which he defines as a “meta-logical rule according to which every element of objective faith – that is, every sentence designated by the heuristic rule – has to be *accepted* as true.”⁵⁴¹ As we have seen in our analysis of baptism, ‘acceptance’ is a central feature of Rappaport’s analysis of ritualised processes. Indeed, while Bochenski does not pursue what in fact constitutes this acceptance, Rappaport develops these insights in terms of how ritual fulfills both the heuristic rule for the designation of which sentences are considered sacred and the acceptance required for such sanctity to obtain. For ritual not only sets apart certain utterances in a privileged position from all other competing truth claims, but the bodily performance of such rituals in which the ultimate sacred postulates are expressed constitutes an acceptance of them.⁵⁴² By acting and uttering the constituent elements of a ritual, the cognised structures encoded in the ritual become indistinguishable from the performer, and because a performer cannot reject the cognised environment at the same time as she or he performs it, the participant demonstrates an acceptance of that cognised

⁵³⁸ Joseph M. Bochenski, *The Logic of Religion* (New York: New York University Press, 1965), 60.

⁵³⁹ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 290.

⁵⁴⁰ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 290-1.

⁵⁴¹ Bochenski, *Logic*, 61, emphasis added.

⁵⁴² Rappaport, *Ritual*, 291.

structure encoded in the ritual performance.⁵⁴³ This acceptance inherent in the ritualised body in turn entails the *obligation* to live in a manner consistent with the cognised environment encoded in the ritual order, thus establishing the participant's ethical identity.

In sum, Rappaport considers participatory performance indispensable to the attribution of sanctity to any discourse, because the sacred is established through the performing of rites that by their nature entail the two features necessary for the forging of the sacred: a heuristic principle by which certain statements are set apart as absolutely true from all other competing statements and a mechanism for embodied acceptance of the truthfulness of these statements.

With our ritual theory in place, what follows is, first, an overview of what Paul refers to as the 'truth of the gospel' in 2:14a. I shall argue that it is the 'truth of the gospel' that is the Pauline equivalent of what Rappaport refers to as an 'ultimate sacred postulate'. Secondly, I shall examine 2:11-14 as to the extent to which the text indicates the Antiochene meals fulfilling heuristic and acceptance mechanisms required for the forging of an ultimate sacred postulate such as the 'truth of the gospel'. Thirdly, I shall inquire as to whether a ritual reading of 2:11-14 can in fact make a distinct contribution to the scholarly debate surrounding the nature of the mixed table-fellowship at Antioch.

7.4. The 'Truth of the Gospel' and the Antiochene Meals

Paul's reference to the 'gospel' in 2:14a picks up his earlier reference in 2:2 (cf. 2:5, 7) that conceptually links together the gospel with divine 'revelation' (ἀποκάλυψις), a link that is itself earlier referenced in 1:12, 16. There Paul denies the human origin for his gospel in 1:12, and instead affirms that he received the gospel δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. the divine/ human contrast in 1:1, 10-11). This revelation of Christ is understood against the backdrop of Paul's sole announcement of Christ's resurrection (1:1; τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν), which represents, apart from Romans, the only reference to the resurrection at the very beginning of a Pauline epistle.⁵⁴⁴ This

⁵⁴³ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 119.

⁵⁴⁴ As Cosgrove, *Cross*, 34 observes, citing Schubert and Funk, "It is characteristic of Paul that he expands the customary epistolary opening and thanksgiving in ways that reveal at the very outset his concerns in writing." Cf. Silva, "Eschatological," 144-45, who points out: "When Paul alters his standardized greeting, it is normally for a reason directly related to the concerns of the letter."

unprecedented event within redemptive history has ‘rescued us from the present evil age’ (ἐξέλγεται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ, 1:4), a phrase that signifies an “eschatological mode of thought” that entails the dawning of a new age.⁵⁴⁵ In light of 1:4, the Galatians in ‘turning away’ (μετατίθημι) from the one who called them by the ‘grace of Christ’ are turning back toward the very age from which they were rescued (1:6).⁵⁴⁶

Thus, as what Paul has said prior to his reference to the εὐαγγέλιον in 2:14a serves to clue his readers as to what is concerning him regarding the Antioch incident, I understand Paul’s concern in 2:11-14 in distinctly *eschatological* terms (cf. 1:1-4, 12, 16; 2:2; 6:14-15). The gospel, for Paul, is a radical reorientation of the world around the Christ-event. As Barclay writes, commenting on Gal 1:1-5: “the grace that issues from ‘God-and-Christ’ has decisively altered the cosmos, effecting a ‘rescue from the present evil age’ which elicits, in return, an ascription of glory to God.”⁵⁴⁷ This Christocentric re-conception of the cosmos is wholly unprecedented in Jewish circles, and has for Paul the effect of reconstituting social and ethical norms and loyalties into distinctly Christ-oriented reconfigurations. Thus Paul can appeal to the transformative effects of the ‘revelation’ of the gospel in his own life (cf. 1:13-17) as well as in the life of the nations and the Jews in 2:7 (cf. the ‘bold’ phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, ‘the good news of the foreskin’, and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς).⁵⁴⁸ Paul’s purpose in 2:11-21, then, is to explicate the significance of the ‘new age’ for Peter and the Antiochenes formally and the Galatians materially.

However, Paul in 2:14a expresses the ‘gospel’ as a genitival qualifier (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) of the term ἀλήθεια, echoing the phrase he used earlier in 2:5: ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (cf. 5:7).⁵⁴⁹ From Homer onward, ἀλήθεια denotes the “full or real state of affairs.”⁵⁵⁰ There is interestingly an almost apocalyptic element to the term, in that ἀλήθεια connotes a sense of disclosure: “ἀλήθεια means *truth* in the sense of the *unhiddenness* and *disclosedness* of the state of affairs which exhibits itself and is

⁵⁴⁵ Silva, “Eschatological,” 146.

⁵⁴⁶ Silva, “Eschatological,” 151.

⁵⁴⁷ J.M.G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, (unpublished manuscript).

⁵⁴⁸ Barclay, *Paul*, n.p.

⁵⁴⁹ Betz, *Galatians*, 92, finds this a rather ‘peculiar’ phrase, and opts for transliterating the phrase as the ‘integrity of the gospel’.

⁵⁵⁰ Bultmann, “ἀλήθεια,” *TDNT* 1.238-51, 238.

therefore perceived in its actuality.”⁵⁵¹ In the LXX, ἀλήθεια is used to translate the Hebrew term אמת (‘truth’, ‘faithfulness’), which refers fundamentally to “a reality which is to be regarded as נאם ‘firm’, and therefore ‘solid’, ‘valid’, or ‘binding’. It thus signifies what is ‘true’.”⁵⁵² Whether ἀλήθεια is translated as ‘truth’ or ‘trustworthiness’, from the vantage point of ritual theory, these qualities both share a sense of the *unquestionable*, the absolutely certain and dependable. Rappaport has noted that such qualities are not self-evident. They do not exist in a vacuum, but are rather forged through the embodied processes of ritualisation. This is because the ‘truth of the gospel’, as an ultimate sacred postulate in the context of ritualised activity, is not self-evidently true; it *becomes* truth, indeed unquestioned truth, through the acceptance and obligation embodied in the ritualised foundry of the shared meal.⁵⁵³

There are several indicators in 2:11-14 that suggest how the Aniochene meals contributed heuristic and obligatory mechanisms by which the eschatological reality of the gospel became ‘truth’:

First, Peter’s actions as they related to the ‘truth of the gospel’ were *seen*. While Paul recounts the evidence more from a counterfactual perspective, we can observe how the bodies at the table served as visible media for the ‘truth of the gospel’. In 2:14a, Paul reports that ‘I *saw*’ (εἶδον, cf. 2:7) how Peter failed to ‘walk’⁵⁵⁴ according to the ‘truth of the gospel’ in his bodily ‘withdrawal’ from the Gentile table. The basic meaning of the verb ὁράω is ‘to see (with the eyes)’, and the term can connote a more cognitive sense of ‘perceive, recognize, experience, consider’.⁵⁵⁵ However, 2:14b explains *how* Peter’s

⁵⁵¹ H. Hübner, “ἀλήθεια,” *EDNT*, 1:57-60, 58.

⁵⁵² G. Quell, “ἀλήθεια,” *TDNT* 1.232-37, 232-3. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ*, interprets ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in light of a Jewish backdrop, where the LXX uses ἀλήθεια to translate the Hebrew term אמת (‘truth’, ‘faithfulness’). Thus when Paul says that ‘the truth of Christ is in me’ in 2 Cor 11:7, 10a, he expresses the fact that “the faithful self-sacrifice of Christ is replicated in his own self-abasement on behalf of others.” The problem was that Peter did not “conform his life to the outworking of God’s truth – his covenant faithfulness – in Jesus the Messiah and his people” (184).

⁵⁵³ This observation does not at all deny that Paul understood the complex of Christ’s death and resurrection as a definite event in the past (Gal 1:1-4; 2:20-21; 3:13-14, etc). The gospel involves for Paul *both* the correspondence theory of truth (a statement that corresponds to a previously existing state of affairs) and performative truth, in that through ritualisation, believers participate in and are identified with that event which is represented (literally *represented*) through the performative dynamics inherent in ritualised act and utterance. It is this ritualised context that frames our present passage.

⁵⁵⁴ Though ὀρθοποδεῖν is a hapax legomenon in the NT and is not found in the LXX or early Jewish literature, its contextual meaning reflects the Jewish conception of halakah, but now modified by the ‘truth of the gospel’. See, e.g., Dunn, ‘Intra-Jewish Polemic’, 461; Bruce, *Galatians*, 132; Fung, *Galatians*, 110 n.32.

⁵⁵⁵ J. Kremer, “ὁράω,” *EDNT*, 2:526-29, 527.

actions were visually embodied in relation to the ‘truth of the gospel’: Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν;⁵⁵⁶ By explaining what he saw in 2:14a with 2:14b, Paul makes clear that in the context of the shared commensality with Gentiles Peter ‘lives’ (ζῇς) as a Gentile and not as a Jew.⁵⁵⁷ There is no indication that Paul is here quoting an accusation by the men from James,⁵⁵⁸ nor is Paul using “extreme or hyperbolic language to polarize a situation.”⁵⁵⁹ Rather Paul has verbalised a gap between Peter’s ethnic identity in which he remains a Jew and the life practices that once characterised a Jew but have now been reconstituted around the ‘truth of the gospel’.⁵⁶⁰ Against the backdrop of Paul’s approval of Peter’s actions in 2:12, it is precisely this gap between Peter’s Jewish ethnicity and his ‘life as a Jew’ that was in fact embodied in the shared lifeworld that comprised the rituals of commensality with Gentiles. The mixed table-fellowship at Antioch was of a visible character where just such a gap was evident and, judging by their fearful reaction to the arrival of the men from James, uncomfortably so for Peter and the other Jews. Thus, the fact that the ‘truth of the gospel’ was violated by the interruption of the mixed table-fellowship after the arrival of the men from James indicates that the meals served as ritualised mechanisms that repositioned faithful Jews into a new life-context in which such faithfulness was no longer determined by ‘living as a Jew’ but now by embodying practices that set apart and were thus revelatory of the ‘truth of the gospel’.

Secondly, there is an indicator of ritualised ‘acceptance’ in 2:11-14. In 2:11, Paul describes Peter as κατεγνωσμένος, which Wilckens takes as having the sense of being ‘condemned before God’.⁵⁶¹ This condemnation is rooted (γάρ) in the fact that Peter and

⁵⁵⁶ On the meaning of ‘Judaizing’, see the discussion in Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 185.

⁵⁵⁷ “By these words, notwithstanding the use of the present tense ζῇς, he refers to Peter’s behavior before the withdrawal.” See Jan Lambrecht, *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001), 160.

⁵⁵⁸ Contra Dunn, *Galatians*, 128-29, who suggests the first half of Paul’s rhetorical response in 2:14b is not his own language but echoes the accusation made by the men from James. Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law*, 81, agrees that “to ‘live like a Gentile’ in Gal 2.11 is an intra-Jewish taunt, relative to what it means to ‘live like a Jew’, and it does *not* imply a complete abandonment of all Jewish observance.”

⁵⁵⁹ Sanders, “Jewish Association,” 187.

⁵⁶⁰ Barclay, *Paul*, n.p.

⁵⁶¹ U. Wilckens, “ὑποκρίνομαι,” *TDNT* 8:559-71, 568 n. 51; so, too, Martyn, *Galatians*, 232; Bruce, *Galatians*, 129; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 72. Bruce, *Galatians*, 129, takes the periphrastic pluperfect κατεγνωσμένος to refer to the fact that the hypocrisy of Peter’s actions is what condemned him. Cf. the more reserved assessment of de Boer, *Galatians* 131: “Paul’s basic point is that Peter did something that deserved condemnation.”

the other Jews ate with the Gentiles prior to the coming of men from James only to withdraw from such practice upon their arrival (2:12). From a ritualised perspective, Peter's and his fellow Jews' participation in the mixed table-fellowship established their *acceptance of* and hence *obligation to* the 'truth of the gospel' embodied by such commensality. And in light of the fact that the failure to meet one's obligations is universally stigmatised as immoral, Peter's failure to fulfill his accepted obligation by withdrawing and separating himself (cf. ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, v. 12) can then be stigmatised as 'condemned' (κατεγνωσμένος, 2:11) and 'hypocritical' (ὑποκρίνομαι, 2:13), thus initiating Paul's response beginning in 2:14b.⁵⁶²

Combining, then, the heuristic significance of the meal that displayed the 'truth of the gospel' with the acceptance of and obligation to it among its participants, we may conclude that the Antiochene meal did not merely symbolise that God had reconciled the world to himself in Christ by reconciling Jew and Gentile; the Antiochene meal in fact *demonstrated* or *revealed* that redemption. Said differently, the eschatological gospel, the radical reorientation of the cosmos toward Christ, became a 'reality' for the participants at the Christologically-defined table. If the 'truth of the gospel' is read as an ultimate sacred postulate, then it is not the truthfulness of the gospel that provides the foundation for the shared meal at Antioch, as so often assumed by scholars; rather, the shared meal is *integral* to the truthfulness of the gospel for its participants, in that it provides the very heuristic and obligatory mechanisms by which the gospel is set apart as absolute and unquestionable as over against all other alternative truth claims. And as such sanctifying mechanisms are realised through the bodies of the ritualised participants, they become unambiguously identified with the 'truth of the gospel' and are thereby themselves set apart from Jewish and Graeco-Roman social norms. The meal was therefore not an addendum to the gospel; the meal *was* the gospel or, better, the heuristic and obligatory mechanism by which the gospel was set apart as true over against all alternative truth claims while setting apart reciprocally the meals as distinctly gospel-revealing commensality. This is why Peter's actions *in relation to the table* are hypocritical, since he is failing to meet the obligation that he has accepted unambiguously by participating recurrently in mixed table-fellowship. As such, the sanctity or truth of the gospel is

⁵⁶² Wilckens, "ὑποκρίνομαι," *TDNT* 8:568 understands the term as connoting 'apostasy' or 'defiance of God'; cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 232.

integral to the performance of the Antiochene meal. To violate the meal is to violate the sanctity of the gospel. Hence Peter stood condemned (2:11).

The ways in which the ‘truth of the gospel’ is grounded in the social arrangements and practices constituting the shared table-fellowship positions us to assess the proposals surveyed above. We have seen in 2:14 two reciprocal descriptions essential for a reconstruction of the Antiochene meals: such commensality (i) embodied the ‘truth of the gospel’ particularly in terms of (ii) effectually opening up a gap for the Jewish participants between their Jewish identity and living Jewishly, a gap which they were now obligated to maintain. Thus, any social reconstruction of the nature of the meals shared at Antioch has to account for these two frames of reference. Because the ‘new perspective’ proposals surveyed above reconstruct the Antiochene mixed table-fellowship in terms of one of the various options available to Jews prior to the Christ-event, I simply do not see how these proposals are able to account for the gap that appeared in the context of the meal between Jewish identity and Jewish practice. The whole point of the pre-messianic meal options was to provide a spectrum whereby Jews could maintain their fidelity to Torah prescriptions in relation to Gentiles, thus assuring continuity between identity and practice. It is precisely such a continuity that according to Paul was disrupted by the gap-producing meals in which Peter participated in 2:14b. One way of addressing this has been Dunn’s proposal that the first half of Paul’s rhetorical response in 2:14b is not his own language but echoes the accusation made by the men from James, such that to ‘live like a Gentile’ is an intra-Jewish taunt, something akin to a sectarian Jewish critique of another Jew found less scrupulous, such as Philo, and does not at all imply a complete abandonment of Jewish food observances.⁵⁶³ However, even if we were to grant this proposal,⁵⁶⁴ that still leaves us with the problem that a meal organised according to halakhic norms would hardly be specific to revealing the fulfillment of the eschatological gospel redeeming God’s people from the ‘present evil age’. It is hard to imagine how such a radical pronouncement as the ‘truth of the gospel’ – the reconstitution of the cosmos around the Christ-event – can be situated comfortably in rituals of commensality that, by virtue of their pre-messianic precedent, offer no indication that such a cosmic event has taken place.

⁵⁶³ Dunn, *Galatians*, 128-29; so, too, Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law*, 81.

⁵⁶⁴ There is no evidence in the text that 2:14b are anyone’s words but Paul’s.

Our ritual reading of the text therefore weighs heavily in favor of the traditional reconstruction of the Antiochene incident. Peter appears to have enjoyed what Bruce calls “unreserved table-fellowship” with the Gentile members of the Antiochene church in a manner comparable to the Luke-Acts portrayal of Peter eating with Cornelius and his family (Acts 10:28; 11:3, 7).⁵⁶⁵ It seems clear from the text that it was the meals themselves at Antioch, as embodiments of the ‘truth of the gospel’, that effected a gap between Peter’s Jewish identity and living Jewishly, one with which the men from James were presumably uncomfortable. The key to Paul’s concern is that Peter’s spatial reconstitution that separated Jew from Gentile in effect interrupted the ‘truth of the gospel’ by re-enacting practices specific to Jewish identity as though such practices were mandatory *for the Jew*. 2:14b affirms that *because* Peter being a Jew now ‘lives’ (= enacts and accepts through bodily practice) in a manner that no longer entails ‘living as a Jew’, his tacit insistence that Gentiles should live within the mandatory stipulations of the Sinai covenant is ‘hypocrisy’.⁵⁶⁶ As Peter’s embodied ‘life’ makes clear, not even the Jew is under such an obligation. In short, Peter stands condemned because his actions in effect reconstitute mandatory Sinai conditions *for Jews*.

This is further highlighted by Paul’s conceptually identifying Peter’s ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίους with the ‘compelling’ (ἀναγκάζω) motif in 2:3 in relation to the ‘false brethren’ in 2:4: just as these false brethren sought to bring ‘us’ (ἡμεῖς; in other words, *both Jew and Gentile*) into the ‘bondage’ of Sinai-specific stipulations (cf. 2:4 with 4:25) and thus violated the ‘truth of the gospel’ (ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 2:5), so now Peter seeks to bring both Jews and Gentiles into the same *covenantal* bondage (2:14a).⁵⁶⁷ Thus, 2:14b in its immediate context suggests that Paul’s rhetorical strategy for Peter formally and the Galatians materially functions as a *qal wahomer*: if living Jewishly is no longer mandatory for the Jew now that the gospel has dawned, *how much more* does it not apply to the nations (i.e. Galatians). Paul’s logic therefore precludes the attempt to explain his rhetorical strategy in light of pre-Messianic Jewish precedent.⁵⁶⁸ Rather, Paul’s logic is

⁵⁶⁵ Bruce, *Galatians*, 129.

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. Lambrecht, *Collected Studies*, 160: “The apodosis ... wants to reveal an inconsistency between Peter’s supposedly persisting Christian conviction and his changed present behavior ...”

⁵⁶⁷ Martyn, *Galatians*, 243; Kok, *Truth*, 65, notes that in “both instances, the heart of the matter is about ‘the truth of the gospel’.”

⁵⁶⁸ Fredriksen’s influential 1991 study (“Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apostolic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2,” *JTS* 42 [1991]: 532-564) accounts for Paul’s rhetorical strategy

derivative of an earth-shattering and cosmic recalibrating event, the revelation of the gospel that has reconstituted social conditions around Christ. It is precisely such social conditions that are evident at Antiochene commensality.

We therefore conclude that the ‘new perspective’ reconstructions surveyed above, by separating the ‘truth of the gospel’ from its embodiment in the ritual meal, fail to give an adequate account for the two reciprocal descriptions essential for a reconstruction of Antiochene commensality: the meals both (i) embodied the ‘truth of the gospel’ and (ii) effectually opening up a gap between being a faithful Jew and living according to Torah prescriptions. The mixed table-fellowship at Antioch was therefore a unique expression of communal life that reconstituted Jewish norms around the dawning of the Christ-event, and thus revealed the truth that all things have been incorporated into Christ’s transformative death and resurrection.

7.5. The Antiochene Meals and the Significance of Embodiment for Gal 2:15-21

We noted above in the ‘Introduction’ that Peter’s withdrawal from Gentile table-fellowship serves as the formal occasion for Paul’s argument in 2:15-21, which is perhaps a summary of what he said to Peter at Antioch. Scholars have observed a two-fold structure in the pericope involving (i) a shift from second-person ‘you’ (in the previous 2:14b) to first-person plural ‘we’ at 2:15-17, and then (ii) to the first person singular ‘I’ at 2:18-21a.⁵⁶⁹ The principal interpretive difficulty entailed in 2:15-16 involves determining the significance of three terms prominent in v. 16 and developed throughout the epistle: ἔργα νόμου, δικαιοῶ and πίστις Χριστοῦ, most especially the first and last terms. In the Pauline corpus, ἔργα νόμου appears eight times (2:16a,c,d; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28) while the phrase πίστις (Ἰησοῦ) Χριστοῦ occurs explicitly only four times other than the

towards the Galatians by demonstrating that Jews made a distinction between Gentile conversion to Judaism (through circumcision and Torah observance) and Gentile salvation (the turning away from idols), and thus the eschatological expectation was one of a mass turning away from idolatry among the Gentiles *without* converting to Judaism (cf. Isa 45:22; 49:6; Zeph 3:9; Zech 8:20-22; Tob 13:11; 14:5-6; Sir 36:11-17; *Sib. Or.* 3:616, 715-24, 772). Thus, “Gentiles are saved as Gentiles: they do not, eschatologically, become Jews” (547). However, this conversion/ salvation distinction simply does not take into account how Paul’s rhetoric in 2:14b is rooted in the embodied significance of the Antiochene meals. For Paul, these meals did not merely reaffirm Jewish expectations, but radically reoriented them. The meals constituted a shared lifeworld where Jews *themselves* were perceived as no longer defined by living Jewishly. Paul approved of this as embodying the ‘truth of the gospel’ while (apparently) the ‘men from James’ did not.

⁵⁶⁹ See, e.g., Jan Lambrecht, “Paul’s Reasoning in Galatians 2:11-21,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, edited by J.D.G. Dunn, 53-74 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 55; Kok, *Truth*, 91.

references in 2:16 (3:22; Rom 3:22, 26; Phil 3:9).⁵⁷⁰ To date, there is no consensus for the structure of 2:16 and its threefold use of the ἔργα νόμου/ πίστις Χριστοῦ contrast.⁵⁷¹ With regard to the significance of ἔργα νόμου, the issue primarily involves its referent: is it a term that embraces the whole Law or does it refer to (an attitude about) a subset of the Law? The former would entail similarity with the use of νόμος throughout the letter; the latter would imply a significant differentiation. With regard to πίστις Χριστοῦ, the issue centers on whether the phrase represents a subjective or objective genitive (Christ being either the subject or object of faith).

The question before us is whether a ritual reading of 2:11-14b can shed light on the significance of these terms and their development in vv. 17-21. I shall first bridge the content of 2:11-14b to 2:15-16 by foregrounding the distinctly visual nature of Paul's use of the perceptual indicator εἰδότες in 2:16a. In continuation with the 'new perspective' proposals surveyed above, I shall then provide an overview of James Dunn's representation of what he has termed the 'new perspective' interpretation of Paul's phrase, ἔργα νόμου. I will argue that the indicators of embodiment in the passage and the surrounding context preclude limiting the phrase to a subset of the Law. I shall then look at Paul's use of δικαίω/ δαικαιοσύνη language and argue that, in light of our analysis of the term in its baptismal context in 1 Cor 6:11, the shared meal at Antioch in fact identified the participants with the status of 'being justified' before God. As regards the phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ, I shall survey briefly the arguments for both the subjective and objective genitive, and then argue that the consistent emphasis on embodiment throughout the passage lends itself decisively in favor of an objective genitive interpretation. I shall then corroborate these findings with further embodied indicators through vv. 17-21 and argue that, taken in its entirety, 2:11-21 provides us with a nexus by which Paul describes an eschatological vision of messianically-defined life at Antioch, most particularly evident in norm-breaking rituals of commensality.

⁵⁷⁰ Kok, *Truth*, 110, 119.

⁵⁷¹ R. Barry Matlock has produced no less than five proposed structures for the verse. Matlock himself presents a highly plausible proposal where the threefold ἔργα νόμου/ πίστις Χριστοῦ contrasts in fact constitute the macro-structure of the verse in terms of (i) a negative-affirmative/ affirmative-negative mood pattern (e.g. *not* ἔργα νόμου *but rather* πίστις Χριστοῦ; πίστις Χριστοῦ, *and not* ἔργα νόμου) which is couched in (ii) an ABBA chiasmic structure (e.g. general principle-personal application-personal application-general principle). See R. Barry Matlock, "The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9," *JSNT* 30.2 (2007): 173-203, esp. 193-99.

7.5.1. Seeing is Believing: Galatians 2:15-16

The majority of scholars interpret 2:15 as continuing the Jew/ Gentile distinction that Paul introduced in v. 14b (cf. the second person singular σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων [v. 14b] and the first person plural ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι [v. 15]: “We are Jews by nature and not sinners from among the Gentiles.”⁵⁷² That ἁμαρτωλοί is modified by ἐξ ἔθνων suggests that this expression is being used in a covenantal sense; that is, the ἔθνη exist outside of the covenantal people of God, who are φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι who possess the Law (cf. Paul’s identification of ἔργα νόμου with ἡμεῖς in 2:16).⁵⁷³ The continuity between v. 15 and v. 16 can be seen by the fact that the phrase ἡμεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι in 2:15 is carried over into 2:16a as the implied subject of εἰδότες, amplified by the common ἡμεῖς in 2:16b.⁵⁷⁴ This unity further underscores the concessive (as per the participle εἰδότες) relationship between 2:15 and 2:16a, with εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι functioning to introduce a well known fact that is generally accepted.⁵⁷⁵

The fact that what is known in 2:16 is objective to both Peter and Paul, together with ‘we Jews’ (ἡμεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι) in 2:15 functioning as the subject of εἰδότες, has led some scholars to speculate whether 2:16a represents an early pre-Pauline Christian tradition formula.⁵⁷⁶ However, the tradition-formula hypothesis is unnecessary given the ritualised context of the εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι clause, for it is that context which accounts for how the content of 2:16a served as a point of agreement with Jewish Christians and, together with its parallel in 2:16d, in turn accounts for how 2:16a,d function as logical grounds for the assertion in 2:16b,c. As we analysed above, an important dimension to Paul’s argument in the verses previous to 2:16 is the visual indicators that he uses to describe Peter’s actions. Paul observes that Peter ‘separated and withdrew’ (ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν, v. 12), which Paul *saw* (εἶδον) as a contradiction of the ‘truth of the gospel’. He thus

⁵⁷² Kok, *Truth*, 102; H. Köster, “φύσις κτλ,” *TDNT* 9:251-77.

⁵⁷³ See “ἔθνος” in *BAGD* 3rd edn, 276-279, 2a: “those who do not belong to groups professing faith in the God of Israel, *the nations, gentiles, unbelievers...*” Cf. “ἔθνος” in *EDNT* 1:381-383; Räisänen, *Jesus*, 115; Betz, *Galatians*, 115; Ridderbos, *Galatians*, 98; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 115. Longenecker, “Defining,” 81.

⁵⁷⁴ Lambrecht, *Collected Studies*, 160; de Boer, *Galatians*, 141; Kok, *Truth*, 107.

⁵⁷⁵ See “οἶδα” in *BAGD* 3rd edn, 693, 1e: “foll. by ὅτι ... is freq. used to introduce a well-known fact that is generally accepted...” So, too, Kok, *Truth*, 108n77; Fung, *Galatians*, 113n7.

⁵⁷⁶ The tradition formula view tends to interpret the ὅτι as a *recitativum*; Kok, *Truth*, 109; Hays, *Faith*, 123; Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation*, 94-109; Martyn, *Galatians*, 249; de Boer, *Galatians*, 143-5.

confronts Peter ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (2:14a).⁵⁷⁷ Against the backdrop of Paul's description of the Antiochene incident, the perfect participle εἰδότες initiating 2:16 has a distinctly *practical* sense to it. Paul does not appear to be suggesting that this shared knowledge is merely cognitive or doctrinal in nature. Rather, in a similar vein to Paul's use of the participle ἰδόντες in 2:7 and the verb εἶδον in 2:14, this knowledge (οἶδα) that he and Peter share is based on observation and perception.⁵⁷⁸ Hence, that which Paul and Peter perceive as regards the relations between the 'works of the Law' (ἔργα νόμου) and the Antiochene meals is antithetical to what Paul recognised or observed in Peter's and the Jews' withdrawal from mixed table-fellowship in 2:14a.⁵⁷⁹

The important point here is that the perceptive nature of εἰδότες entails that the three terms, ἔργα νόμου, δικαιοῦω and πίστις Χριστοῦ, should be understood in the context of the mechanisms of embodiment, as factors that could be seen and discerned. Said differently, that 'a man is not justified by the works of the Law but through faith in Christ' represented a state of affairs that was perceived by both Peter and Paul, and it is this embodied significance that may shed fresh light on the three controverted terms in 2:16: ἔργα νόμου, δικαιοῦω and πίστις Χριστοῦ. I shall examine each in turn.

7.5.2. ἔργα νόμου

The phrase ἔργα νόμου has been the subject of a number of proposed interpretations and a detailed consideration of each is beyond the scope of this study.⁵⁸⁰ In continuity

⁵⁷⁷ Bruce, *Galatians*, 132, notes that Paul's "rebuke was thus public as well as personal ('to his face')."

⁵⁷⁸ Classically, while the epistemic terms γινώσκω and ἐπίσταμαι tend to connote the acquisition of knowledge ('come to know') and the practical faculty of knowing respectively, οἶδα tends to connote knowledge based on observation or perception ('to have seen'). Pauline usage generally conforms to this classical pattern. See, A. Horstmann, "οἶδα," *EDNT*, 2:493-4, 494; Seesemann, "οἶδα," *TDNT* 5:116-9.

⁵⁷⁹ The term ὁράω is often used to indicate *recognition*. Note the similar usage in Matt 9:2 and 27:3. See Kremer, "ὁράω," *EDNT*, 2:527.

⁵⁸⁰ See, e.g., Sanders, *Paul*; Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (WUNT 29; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983); idem, *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*, JSNTSup 43 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 18-55; Douglas Moo "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years," *SJT* 40 (1987): 287-307; Frank Thielman, *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*, NovTSup 61 (Leiden: EJ Brill, 1989); Thomas R. Schreiner, "Works of the Law," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin, 975-79 (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993); Scott J. Hafemann, "Paul and His Interpreters since F.C. Baur," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993), 666-679; Colin G. Kruse, *Paul, the Law, and Justification* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996); D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, ed, *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, Vol. 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001).

with our analysis of 2:11-14b, I am particularly interested in interacting with the continuation of the proposals stemming from Dunn's paradigmatic essay entitled, "The New Perspective on Paul."⁵⁸¹ Dunn argues that what E.P. Sanders termed 'covenantal nomism' stands more in continuity than in contrast with Paul's theology.⁵⁸² Dunn argues that the Law/faith contrast in Gal 2:16 is not a contrast between justification by faith and the Law, but rather a contrast between God's covenant defined in terms of nationalist exclusivism and multinational inclusivism.⁵⁸³ With the advent of Christ, the covenant has been fulfilled in such a way that it can no longer exclude Gentiles from membership. At the heart of Dunn's argument is his emphasis on the sociological significance of the phrase 'works of the Law' (ἔργα νόμου), with the term entailing (though not exclusive to) particular Jewish ceremonial observances that function as identifying boundary markers for the covenant people of God.⁵⁸⁴ That the Law is not exclusive to this sociological function accounts for Paul's positive statements about God's Law as such are understood in the broader sense of God's ethical will for his people.⁵⁸⁵ Thus Paul's polemic in Galatians is not against a legalism but against a particular attitude to the Law as it functions to socially ostracise Gentile Christians from full acceptance as the new covenant people of God.⁵⁸⁶ Now that Christ has come, Paul is arguing against those who want to continue to embrace those aspects of the Law that contradict the soteriological equality of Jews and Gentiles before God.

Dunn's proposal and the so-called 'new perspective' throw into relief three observations which arise from our ritual reading of the text:

⁵⁸¹ Published now in Dunn, *Jesus*, 183-214.

⁵⁸² Dunn, *Jesus*, 186.

⁵⁸³ Dunn, *Jesus*, 194.

⁵⁸⁴ Dunn, *Jesus*; "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997): 147-153.

⁵⁸⁵ Dunn, *Jesus*, 223-25.

⁵⁸⁶ Contra his own reading of the text, Dunn, *Galatians*, 135 comments: "The phrase itself ('works of the Law') means most naturally 'deeds or actions which the Law requires'...most Jews would, most naturally, understand the phrase to mean 'the obligations laid upon Israelites by virtue of their membership of Israel.'" However, Dunn goes on to argue that the term most likely reflects the concern of Second-Temple Judaism "to draw the lines of demarcation round covenant righteousness as clearly as possible...In principle that meant all that the Law required. But in practice the faithfulness of the sectarian was determined by his demonstration of loyalty to the sect's distinctive interpretations of the Law on disputed points" (136). Thus Dunn argues "The issue expressed in 'works of the Law', in other words, was *not* whether membership of the people of God entailed various obligations (Paul had no doubt that it did), but whether it entailed an in effect sectarian interpretation of these obligations, whether it entailed obligations designed to exclude others, whether it entailed that Jew remain distinct from Gentile" (137). Thus, the 'works of the Law' function as a sub-set of the Sinai Law within both Jewish polemic and Paul's immediate argument.

First, the perceptive nature of εἰδότες in 2:16a weighs heavily in the direction of interpreting ἔργα νόμου in light of the Antiochene incident itself, that is, as the substance of ‘living Jewishly’ (2:14b). As Barclay observes, ‘living Jewishly’ “can be re-expressed in terms of the Law since Jewish life-practices were understood by Paul, and by his contemporaries, to be regulated by the Torah.”⁵⁸⁷ In other words, living Jewishly is the *embodiment* of the Law, and thus there is little reason not to take the modified noun ἔργα as denoting this embodiment.⁵⁸⁸

Secondly, the fact that justification apart from the works of the Law could in fact be *seen* or *sensed* further corroborates that the meals at Antioch visually relativised Torah-observance in a manner comparable to Paul’s observation in 2:16a. That is, the Antiochene meals were palpable and substantial embodiments of a shared lifeworld where one could observe that the ‘works of the Law’ were no longer necessary components to justification before God. The stark and unambiguous assertion that ‘by the works of the Law no flesh will be justified’ (2:16d) which is rooted in the perceptive knowledge of 2:16a leaves little room for a meal that conformed to basic Torah regulations. This observation precludes the assessment of the Antioch incident as a controversy over the *degree* or *extent* of Law observance rather than the stark contrast between two different ways of life (cf. 2:14b). We therefore find implausible the proposal that the phrase ἔργα νόμου can be limited to circumcision, dietary laws or any other subset of the Law that required Gentiles to go beyond the basic table etiquette acceptable to Jewish sensibilities.⁵⁸⁹ Rather, the term ἔργα νόμου in 2:16, 3:2, 5, 10 functions more

⁵⁸⁷ Barclay, *Paul*, n.p.

⁵⁸⁸ This reading therefore takes issue with abstracting ἔργα from its genitival qualifier νόμου, as if the issue were *human* works in a general anthropological sense. This view has taken historically two forms, the *quantitative* view, which argues that the Law requires perfect obedience, and the *qualitative* view, which argues that the very attempt at keeping the Law is itself sin, since the Law’s demands *themselves* lead to sinful boasting and pride. For a helpful explication of the terms “quantitative” and “qualitative” views of the Law, see Douglas Moo “Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987): 287-307; Kok, *Truth*, 111-12; and Cosgrove, *Cross*, 10f., especially the latter two and their discussion of Bultmann on the qualitative view.

⁵⁸⁹ So, too, Stuhlmacher, who observes that the expression “works of the commandments” in 2 Baruch 57:2 refers to keeping the Torah *in general*, which is further reflected in Paul’s equating “works” with obeying God’s commandments (cf. Gal 5:6 with 1 Cor 7:19; 2 Cor 9:8; Eph 2:10). See Peter Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting Paul’s Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 44. On the relationship between the term ἔργα νόμου and מעשי תורה in 4QMMT, see Dunn, “4QMMT,” 147-153; Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting*, 43; Hafemann, “Paul and the Exile,” 342-343n33.

as a subjective genitive embodying Torah observance in general which has now been relativised by the Christ-event.⁵⁹⁰

Thirdly, against the backdrop of the ‘truth of the gospel’ revealed eschatologically through the shared ritual meals at Antioch, the terms ἔργα νόμου and νόμος⁵⁹¹ appear to be used by Paul as metonymies for a lifeworld oriented toward loyalty to the Sinai or old covenant (cf. Gal 4:25; 2 Cor 3:14) which has now been relativised by virtue of the revelation of the messianic age or new covenant in the mixed table-fellowship at Antioch (cf. Gal 1:4; 6:15; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6). As such, ἔργα νόμου and πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2:16 function conceptually not so much as *sociological* boundary markers, but rather as *eschatological* boundary markers between two different ages within God’s plan of redemption: an age defined by Torah and an age now reconstituted around Christ (cf. 1:4). The important point here is that these ages are in fact *embodied*; they are revealed through two mutually exclusive lifeworlds, one in where meals are regulated according to the norms of the works of the Law, and the other in which meals are constituted according to πίστις Χριστοῦ. For Paul, the lifeworld constituted according to πίστις Χριστοῦ is nothing less than a ritualised revelation that God has in fact inaugurated a rescue from the ‘present evil age’ for both Jew and Gentile in such a way that all norms indicative of the present age are reconstituted around the Christ-event.

7.5.3. δικαίω/ δικαιοσύνη

The *δικ root appears five times in 2:15-21 and twelve times throughout the letter.⁵⁹² The verb δικαίω appears three times in 2:16, is referenced again in 2:17 and four more times in the development of Paul’s epistolary argument (3:8, 11, 24; 5:4). The noun δικαιοσύνη is found in 2:21; 3:6, 21; 5:5, with a single articular occurrence of δίκαιος in 3:11 (quoting Hab 2:4).⁵⁹³ The significance of the *δικ root words is a subject

⁵⁹⁰ Cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 261: “Although the precise expression *erga nomou* has not been found in any Greek literature prior to Galatians, Jewish Christians of Paul’s time – and Gentile Christians instructed by Jewish Christians (the Galatians, for example) – would have had little difficulty grasping its meaning. It refers simply to observance of God’s Law.” So, too, de Boer, *Galatians*, 145-8.

⁵⁹¹ The term ἔργα νόμου in 2:16 is picked up by the shorthand use of νόμος, cf. 2:19a, 21b.

⁵⁹² Longenecker, “Defining,” 81n17 observes that all five occurrences in 2:15-21 appear in strategic positions: at the points of agreement (2:16), disagreement (2:17), and conclusion (2:21).

⁵⁹³ For an argument that Hab 2:4 is the key text for interpreting Paul’s use of δικαίω/ δικαιοσύνη, see Francis Watson, “By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution,” in Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (eds.), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2009), 147-63.

of considerable discussion among scholars.⁵⁹⁴ In the context of Jewish Christianity, the issue involves whether one retains covenant membership by transferring from one form of Judaism to another (messianic) form, or whether one must in fact “convert” to a new religion (i.e. Christianity).⁵⁹⁵

Given the enormity of the subject, the following points will attempt to summarise the features of δικαίω/ δικαιοσύνη for 2:15-21 in terms of their significance for the Antiochene meal in particular:

First, as we saw in our analysis of 1 Cor 6:11, there is broad agreement among scholars that the NT use of δικαίω has a declarative or forensic meaning (e.g. to declare someone righteous, vindicated or acquitted), the significance of which is picked up from the use of δικαίω in the LXX influenced by the Hebrew semantic background. The basic Hellenistic meaning of δικαίω/ δικαιοσύνη language represented in the LXX is “to be thought, or adjudged, ‘righteous’ (in the sense of ‘in the right, proper’ or innocent’).”⁵⁹⁶ It is in this respect that there are close parallels between 2:16 in relation to v. 17 and our earlier study of 1 Cor 6:9-11. Similar to 1 Cor 6:9-11, the issue of sin provides the backdrop for Paul’s use of the term δικαίω in Gal 2:16 (cf. ἁμαρτωλοί and ἁμαρτία in v. 15 and v. 17 respectively). There is also a parallel between Paul’s emphasis on the current status of believers and its relation to their *future* status. In 1 Cor 6:9-11, Paul’s association between their ‘justification’ and their future ‘judgment’ of the world and angels meant that the Corinthians have been delivered in the *present* from the current age constituted by those who will not inherit (κληρονομέω) the kingdom of God (6:9-10) in the *future*. Similarly, in Gal 2:17, Paul speaks of justification as an eschatological event, in that believers are those who are ‘seeking to be justified in Christ’ (ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ), as Seifrid notes: “In a crucial sense, they do not yet have their justification but wait for it in hope (see Gal 5:5).”⁵⁹⁷

Secondly, in Gal 2:16, as in 1 Cor 6:11, the specific issue at hand is the evidential basis for just such a declaration, namely, the ritualised body. In 1 Cor 6:11, the context involved the ritualised establishment of the indicative-imperative relationship

⁵⁹⁴ See our discussion on 1 Cor 6:11 above.

⁵⁹⁵ Kok, *Truth*, 131.

⁵⁹⁶ Barclay, *Paul*, n.p.

⁵⁹⁷ Seifrid, “Paul,” 218.

characteristic of Pauline ethics, and thus δικαιόω was understood as a performative declaration that identified the baptised body as now loyal to Christ, establishing unambiguously the believer's obligation toward that somatically-identified loyalty. We see a similar ritualised identification as regards the participants in the Antiochene meal. For as Paul argues in 2:16, the evidential basis (εἰδότες) for one who is justified before God is one's somatic identification with πίστις Χριστοῦ. In the context of 2:11-14, this justification through πίστις Χριστοῦ is a somatic reality that is identified by participation in meals the occasions for which are specific to the Christ-event. Antiochene commensality thus unambiguously attests to the *status* of those participating in the meals as those identified with a reality that has been reconfigured around Christ's death on the cross and his rescuing them from the 'present evil age' through his resurrection (1:1-4; 2:20-21).⁵⁹⁸

Studies in the sociology of the meal explain the status or identity significance of those who participate in rituals of commensality. In her influential essay, "Deciphering a Meal," Mary Douglas argues that every act of conviviality is encoded with messages found in the social and hierarchical patterns of inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and transactions across boundaries, messages that communicate the presence of a shared lifeworld.⁵⁹⁹ As meals provide the social group with clear identification and recognition, food can be thought of as a "badge of *group identity* ... closely identified with the sense of continuity and cohesion of the community..."⁶⁰⁰ The cohesiveness of the shared meal is further evidenced by the fact that meals, in contrast to 'snacks', are most often highly structured events, with certain combinations of foods served in a highly definite

⁵⁹⁸ Here we take issue with Nanos, "What was at Stake," 300-4, who argues that the issue of status at the Antiochene meals involved the failure on the part of Jewish believers to evidence a distinction between Gentile guests and Jewish proselytes. Nanos is correct that Gentile participation in Jewish food practices does not necessarily *identify* Gentiles as Jewish proselytes, but his attempt at making a hard distinction between 'identity' (e.g. circumcision) and 'behaviour' (e.g. food practices) in the context of the Antiochene meals is contradicted by the Galatian text and its focus on the body. Not only does Nanos fail to provide evidence for a distinction between guest and proselyte at Jewish table-fellowships, but he fails to recognise that Paul sees the behaviour of the body in Gal 2:11-21 as the location for identity, both for the Jew (who through the meals no longer lives Jewishly) and the Gentile (who through the meals evidences a status of justification before God in Christ). Hence, his interpretation of ζῆλος in 2:14b as identity language rather than behaviour description is decidedly forced.

⁵⁹⁹ "Deciphering a Meal," in eadem, *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 249-75, 249.

⁶⁰⁰ Cecil G. Helman, *Culture, Health and Illness: An Introduction for Health Professionals* 2nd Edition (Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, 1990), 41.

sequence.⁶⁰¹ This structural significance is indicative of the *social* structures inherent in the meal. For example, who sits or reclines where is often determinative of status and role within the community. So, too, the distribution of food: who gets what and how much is a further indicator of one's position within the network of relationships gathered around the meal. Feeley-Harnik argues that "meals ... symbolize proper behavior among social groups in relation to one another and in relation to God. Who may eat what with whom is a direct expression of social, political and religious relations."⁶⁰² Catherine Bell thus observes that participation in the sharing of a meal "is a common ritual means for defining and reaffirming the full extent of the human and cosmic community. Whether that community is conceived to be rigidly hierarchical or fundamentally egalitarian, the principle of sharing food marks it as a community."⁶⁰³

It is therefore the participants that constitute collectively the 'truth of the gospel' in the shared table-fellowship at Antioch that are identified with the status of 'justified' in the presence of God. This explicit link between Christ-centered meals and 'justification' means that participants are identified as having been delivered from the 'present evil age' (1:4), the 'curse' of the Law (3:10) and the 'elements of this world' (4:3) to stand in the presence of God as innocent (or acquitted) by virtue of the Messiah's suffering and death (2:16, 20-21; 3:13-14; etc). Paul thus argues in Gal 2:16 that God's declaration is attributed to those who participate in a shared lifeworld constituted according to πίστις Χριστοῦ, specifically to those who participate in meals constituting a somatic identification with Christ.

7.5.4. πίστις Χριστοῦ

As regards the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the scholarly debate surrounds the objective genitive understanding of the phrase (i.e. the faith *in* Christ) and the subjective genitive understanding (i.e. the faith *of* Christ).⁶⁰⁴ The phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ appears

⁶⁰¹ Helman, *Culture*, 42.

⁶⁰² Gillian Feeley-Harnik, *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in Early Christianity* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), 2.

⁶⁰³ *Ritual*, 123.

⁶⁰⁴ For an overview of the debate, see Bird and Preston, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*; Sigve Tonstad, "πίστις Χριστοῦ: Reading Paul in a New Paradigm," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring 2002): 37-59. For a sample of the arguments in support of the subjective genitive, see Hays, *Faith, passim*; Kok, *Truth*, 119-129; Martyn, *Galatians*, 251, 270-75; Longenecker, "Defining," 79; de Boer, *Galatians*, 148-51; in support of the objective genitive, see Matlock, "Rhetoric," 173-203; Dunn, *Theology*,

seven times in the Pauline corpus,⁶⁰⁵ with a similar construction of πίστις followed by τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ in 2:20b and the parallel ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22.⁶⁰⁶ The evidence for both proposals can be presented here only in summary manner.

Proponents for the subjective genitive have argued the following:

(i) The objective genitive reading creates an awkward redundancy in several texts (cf. Gal 2:16; 3:22; Rom 3:22; Phil 3:9).⁶⁰⁷ (ii) In the twenty-four cases where Paul modifies πίστις with a person's name or personal pronoun in the genitive case, they are all subjective genitives.⁶⁰⁸ The expression ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (3:22; Rom 3:26) has a precise parallel in Rom 4:16, ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, and is similar to πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ ('faithfulness of God') in Rom 3:3, both of which are clearly subjective genitives.⁶⁰⁹ (iii) The meaning of "faithfulness" dominates the LXX usage of πίστις.⁶¹⁰

Proponents for the objective genitive have argued the following:

(i) There is little justification to translate the anarthrous phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ as "the faith in Christ" (cf. the definite article supplied in Rom 3:3).⁶¹¹ (ii) The context of 2:16 presents πίστις in a triple antithesis with 'works of the Law', moving from πίστις in 2:16a to 'belief' in 2:16b (where Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is clearly the direct object of πιστεύω) back to πίστις in 2:16c, with the repetition serving to underline Paul's point that the works of the Law are no longer necessary.⁶¹² (iii) Paul never describes or develops Jesus' special relationship with God in terms of 'faith' (πίστις) or 'believing' (πιστεύειν).⁶¹³

The exegetical task at hand is to determine whether a ritual reading of the Law/faith contrast in 2:16 can provide any leverage for either the objective or subjective rendering. While it is quite easy to imagine how the Antiochene meals embodied the faith of believers (cf. 2:16b), it is far more difficult to imagine how the meals at Antioch

379-385; Cosgrove, *Cross*, 55-56; Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting*, 65-66; Barclay, *Obeying*, 78 n.8.

⁶⁰⁵ Rom 3:22, 26; twice in Gal 2:16; once in Gal 3:22; Eph 3:12; Phil 3:9.

⁶⁰⁶ Kok, *Truth*, 119.

⁶⁰⁷ See the catena of references in Matlock, "Rhetoric," 174-6, though Matlock himself opts for the objective genitive.

⁶⁰⁸ See the argument and sources detailed in John McRay, *Paul: His Life and Teaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 353-359; cf. Kok, *Truth*, 121.

⁶⁰⁹ Kok, *Truth*, 120.

⁶¹⁰ Douglas A. Campbell, "'Faith' in Paul with particular reference to the questions of divine and human agency," http://www.abdn.ac.uk/divinity/Gathercole/paper-campbell.htm#_ftnref14 (2004).

⁶¹¹ Dunn, *Theology*, 381.

⁶¹² Dunn, *Theology*, 381.

⁶¹³ Stuhlmacher, *Revisiting*, 65-6.

embodied *Christ's* faith.⁶¹⁴ As we saw above, 2:14a implies that since the Antiochene Jewish believers' failure to 'walk according to the truth of the gospel' (οὐκ ὀρθοδοῦσιν = *infidelity*!) could be seen by their collective withdrawal, so their sharing of food in v. 12 indicates a shared faith on the part of the meal participants. Further, in 2:14b, Paul notes that the meals evidence a manner of life where a faithful Jew now *lives* (ζῶω) 'as a Gentile and not as a Jew', with the terms of that faithfulness reconstituted around the Christ-event.

With the embodied significance of ἔργα νόμου and δικαιοῦ in place, a ritual reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ involves a body oriented toward Christ through the participation in a shared meal, which lends itself in favor of the objective genitive interpretation. Said differently, πίστις Χριστοῦ is an attribute of the body which participates in Antiochene meals, an attribute that entails allegiance toward Christ in distinction from the Law.⁶¹⁵ From the vantage point of identification, πίστις involves an embodied orientation toward Christ comparable to ways in which ἔργα involve an embodied orientation toward νόμος. In this sense the shared meals were in ritual terms both allo-communicative and auto-communicative.⁶¹⁶ As we noted in our studies of Gal 3:26-29 and 1 Cor 12:13, participating in a ritual sends two concurrent messages: one message is sent to one's co-participants that the one performing the ritual shares with the others a common identity specific to the ritualised community, while a second message is sent to oneself confirming one's experiential state in relation to the ritualised group. We noted further that both messages are fused together through the mechanisms of *embodiment*: through ritualised actions and utterances, the body functions as a transmitter both toward others and also toward the self. It is this fusion between the public and the private in ritualised activity that provides the foundation for the establishment of social obligation.

The key here is that, given our visual indicators, Peter and Paul *perceive* that a man is not justified by the works of the Law but through faith in Christ, which entails the fact

⁶¹⁴ Note Matlock's observation: "To speak thus of a simple choice between 'subjective' or 'objective' genitive options is a useful oversimplification. At bottom, the choice is between taking the πίστις in question to be that of Christ or of 'believers'" ("Rhetoric," 173 n.1).

⁶¹⁵ I am interpreting here the conjunction ἐὰν μὴ in 2:16a as indicating an oppositive or adversative (rather than an exceptive) relationship between ἔργα νόμου and πίστις Χριστοῦ, in accordance with Paul's use of οὐκ in 2:16c to highlight an *adversative* relationship between the νόμος/πίστις motifs in 2:16c, d. See the grammatical discussion in Longenecker, *Galatians*, 83-84; Kok, *Truth*, 143-144.

⁶¹⁶ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 51.

that the faithful Jew is now no longer defined perceptually by those practices that defined ‘life as a Jew’ (2:14b) but rather through those practices that now reveal ‘faith in Christ’ (i.e. a life oriented toward Christ and not the Law). Thus, πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2:16 is an attribute of their *ritualised bodies*, which means that πίστις Χριστοῦ entails a perceptible somatic orientation and loyalty. For as Paul argues in 2:16, the evidential basis (εἰδότες) for one who is justified before God is one’s *identification* with πίστις Χριστοῦ which, in the context of 2:11-14, is a somatic reality that is identified and perceived by participation in meals the occasions for which are specific to the Christ-event. Thus, Paul presents a vision of πίστις that is first and foremost identified with the bodies of the participants in the meal, such that their bodies evidence an orientation toward Christ and not the works of the Law and *thus* evidence the ‘truth of the gospel’. The bodily allegiances at the Antiochene table are directed evidentially toward Christ and not toward the Torah. This ritual reading of 2:16 therefore concludes that the objective genitive is most consistent with the somatic indicators entailed in the text.

7.5.5. Galatians 2:17-21 and an Eschatological Lifeworld

The importance of embodiment for interpreting the terminology in 2:16 is corroborated by the interrogatory language used by Paul in v. 17: If seeking to be justified in Christ means ‘being found’ (εὕρισκω) as sinners, would this not make Christ a ‘minister of sin’? The intensive function of the plural pronoun αὐτοί (‘we *ourselves*’) together with the adverbial intensive/ ascensive καί (‘too’, ‘also’, ‘even’, etc) indicate that the first person plural εὐρέθημεν refers to the ἡμεῖς in 2:15-16 (i.e. ‘we Jews by nature’).⁶¹⁷ This is further confirmed by the reappearance of ἁμαρτωλοί in 2:17b, which leaves little justification to assert that Paul has switched meaning on either the still-resonating use of ἡμεῖς or ἁμαρτωλοί in 2:15.⁶¹⁸ Paul’s use of the aorist passive εὐρέθημεν may thus be taken as a reference to the Antioch incident in 2:11-14 and Peter’s rationale for ‘withdrawal’ from Gentile table-fellowship, which is the event that

⁶¹⁷ Kok, *Truth*, 198; contra Betz, *Galatians*, 119-20 who sees a shift Jewish Christians in 2:15-16 to Gentile Christians (i.e. the Galatians) in 2:17.

⁶¹⁸ So, too, Schlier, *Galater*, 95 n.6; Barclay, *Obeying*, 78-9; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 89; Fung, *Galatians*, 119; Kok, *Truth*, 199.

sparked the speech in the first place.⁶¹⁹ In contrast to the justification by faith in Christ that Peter and Paul ‘perceived’ (εἰδότες) at the shared meals, the *appearance* (εὐρέθημεν = find, discover)⁶²⁰ of ‘life like a Gentile’ at the mixed table-fellowship is interpreted as sin (= ἁμαρτωλοί, ‘sinners’) in the eyes of the ‘men from James’ or ‘those of the circumcision’, accounting for Peter’s φοβούμενος (2:12).⁶²¹ With 2:17b deriving its meaning from the Antioch incident and its Pauline development in 2:14b-16, Paul’s false inference (*realis*)⁶²² in 2:17c appears to engage in a word play between ἁμαρτωλοί/ ἁμαρτία: how can Christ-believing Jews engage in food behaviour that disregards the Law (ἁμαρτωλοί) without appearing lawless (engaging in ἁμαρτία) at the initiation of Christ?⁶²³

Paul’s absolute negation (μὴ γένοιτο) is directed to the assertion that Christ could be in service of⁶²⁴ lawlessness (ἁμαρτίας διάκονος). The explanation for such an impossibility is provided in 2:18, where Paul grounds (γάρ) the hypothetical situation in v. 17 with what may in fact be an allusion to the Jeremiah new covenant preamble (Jer 31:28; LXX 38:28) where God promises ‘to tear down’ (καθαίρειν) and ‘to build’ (οικοδομεῖν, cf. Jer. 1:10; 12:16-17; 24:6; 33:7).⁶²⁵ The allusion serves to contextually identify the opposition between καταλύω and οικοδομῶ in the protasis in 2:18a with the ἔργα νόμου (cf. ἃ ... ταῦτα in 2:17) of 2:16.⁶²⁶ Such an allusion would echo Paul’s earlier use of a redemptive-historical *topos* from the calls of the prophets in the OT (1:15; cf. Isa 49:1-6; Jer 1:5-6; and Isa 50:4), where Paul “casts his call to apostleship in the mold of

⁶¹⁹ Contra Lambrecht, *Collected Studies*, 162, who sees Paul’s reference to ἁμαρτωλοί in 2:17a as referring to “that fundamental sinfulness which in v. 15 is said to be characteristic of the Gentiles: we too, as Jews, before we believed in Christ, were sinners (i.e., by pre-conversional sins) just like the Gentiles.” Such an interpretation causes Lambrecht to posit a “break, a caesura,” between v. 17 and v. 18, where Paul comes back to the Antioch incident after reflecting on the time of justification (163).

⁶²⁰ The verb εὐρίσκω here has the sense of an ‘intellectual discovery based upon reflection, observation, examination, or investigation’ (BAGD, “εὐρίσκω,” 2 [325]). S. Pedersen notes a forensic sense for εὐρίσκω, relating to “the conclusion of an investigation into the facts of a charge (αἰτία) or of a dispute (ζήτησις, ζήτημα; cf. Acts 23:28f.; 24:20, etc.)” (EDNT, 2:82-84, 84; Cf. H. Preisker, “εὐρίσκω,” TDNT 2:769-70).

⁶²¹ The passive εὐρέθημεν has initiated some scholarly speculation as to the identity of those by whom ‘we are found sinners’: the men from James, the circumcision/Jews, Jewish Christians, etc. However, the text simply leaves the source of the perception unstated.

⁶²² The *realis* position here advocated sees Paul as putting forth a premise with which Paul agrees (we were found to be sinners, that is, in the eyes of some) from which is drawn a false conclusion (Christ is a minister of sin). See the extended discussion in Kok, *Truth*, 166-85; cf. Lambrecht, *Collected Studies*, 162.

⁶²³ Cf. Kok, *Truth*, 200-201; Dunn, *Galatians*, 141.

⁶²⁴ Our translation for διάκονος follows Weisner, EDNT 1:302; cf. also Kok, *Truth*, 205.

⁶²⁵ See Dunn, *Galatians*, 142-143; Garlington, *Galatians*, 118.

⁶²⁶ So, too, Kok, *Truth*, 224.

Jeremiah's call to be a 'prophet to the nations' (Gal 1:15; cf. Jer 1:5), for Jeremiah prophesied not only to Judah but to 'all nations' as well (Jer 32:15, 18-26).⁶²⁷ If Paul is alluding to the preamble of Jeremiah's 'new covenant', such an allusion would be highly significant for his clarification, since it is precisely the Jeremiah new covenant that is ritualised in the celebration of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:25). While we simply cannot be certain whether or not the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the context of the Antiochene meals,⁶²⁸ an allusion to the new covenant in Jeremiah would underscore the distinctly *eschatological* significance of the meals which embody the 'truth of the gospel': now that the promised new covenant has arrived in Christ, the 'works of the Law' have been 'destroyed' (κατέλυσα). The only way in which a Jewish participant in the Antiochene meals could be legitimately considered a sinner (παραβάτης) is by building up again the conditions that defined 'living as a Jew' prior to the Christ-event. But to do so would be nothing less than to reconstitute pre-messianic conditions and thereby deny the sufficiency of the cross to usher in the messianic age (2:21).

Gal 2:19 offers a second explanation (as per the explanatory γάρ) for Paul's denial that a lifeworld constituted around Christ as opposed to the Law entails lawlessness in 2:17. In a fashion similar to his argument in 2 Cor 3:6 (which explicitly references the Jeremiah 'new covenant'), Paul develops the Law/faith contrast in terms of ἀποθνήσκω and ζάω motifs (cf. συνεσταύρωμαι with ἐν πίστει ζῶ).⁶²⁹ The ζάω motif that appeared initially in Paul's rhetorical question toward Peter in 2:14b is developed five-fold in the span of vv. 19-20. Consistent with his use of the verb in 2:14b, Paul here employs repeatedly the ζάω motif in order to describe a way of life that has been overwhelmed by the Christ-event. The Law is placed in antithetical terms to a 'life to God': Paul can say that it is διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον in 2:19 which, according to his exegetical Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι in 2:20 (cf. 3:13-14; 4:3-7; Rom 6:6), implies that 'death to the Law' was precisely what was entailed in Christ's own death.⁶³⁰ Thus, Paul can 'through the Law die

⁶²⁷ Scott, *Nations*, 154 n93. For a survey of texts evidencing the prophetic-call pattern, see Hafemann, *Paul*, 42-89.

⁶²⁸ Indeed, the verb συνεσθίω simply connotes 'eating with' (1 Cor 5:11; Luke 15:2; Acts 11:3; cf. LXX Gen 43:32), which is not specific to the Lord's Supper. So, too, Kok, *Truth*, 63 n.51, Betz, *Galatians*, 107; Fung, *Galatians*, 106. For a tentative argument against the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Antioch, see Zetterholm, *Formation of Christianity*, 163-4.

⁶²⁹ Cf. Ridderbos, *Galatians*, 104, observes that the "death/ life" motifs in 2:19-20 function as the Galatians' counterpart to the "letter/ Spirit" contrast in 2 Cor 3:6.

⁶³⁰ Similarly, Cosgrove, *Cross*, 139.

to the Law', so that he might 'live to God', an apparent allusion to Hab 2:4 (cf. 3:10-11).⁶³¹ The two motifs by which this new age is inaugurated – the death and resurrection of Christ (cf. 1:1, 4) – together characterise Paul's apostolic ministry, as Paul's co-crucifixion with Christ is accompanied by 'Christ's (resurrection) life in me' (2:20a; cf. 1:16). Paul explains this Christ-centered life in terms of the somatic indicator σάρξ, often translated simply as 'body'.⁶³² Paul makes clear that his 'living in the flesh' is lived 'now' (νῦν) by the same 'faith' (πίστις) in the 'Son of God' (2:20b) through which a person is declared 'justified' (2:16) and identified by virtue of one's participation in the Antiochene meals. This ongoing work of God lived out by faith provides the foundation for Paul's subsequent rhetorical question addressed to the Galatians: "Are you so foolish? Having *begun* by the Spirit, are you *now* being perfected by the flesh (3:3)?"

Thus, now that the dawning of the messianic age has overcome the 'present evil age' (1:4; 3:13-14; 4:3-7), Paul believes that Peter's tacit insistence on the obligatory validity of the Law even for Jews is nothing less than 'nullifying (ἀθετῶ) the grace of God' (2:21a) by denying the sufficiency of the cross to inaugurate the messianic age (2:21b). For Paul, the apostolic disruption of mixed table-fellowship at Antioch represented by Peter's (passive) imposition of Sinai-specific stipulations nullified the eschatological vision of 'living messianically' (that is, embodying a 'rescue from the present evil age', 1:4) that such meals reveal. As an apostle called to embody the new covenant inaugurated by the Messiah (2:16, 20), Paul believes that for him to assert the mandatory validity of the 'works of the Law' even over Jews would in effect reconstitute pre-Pentecost social conditions that are the necessary preconditions for Paul (or Peter) 'appearing' to be a 'transgressor' at the Antiochene meals (1:4; 2:18; 3:10, 19-25; 4:1-2, 21-20).

And thus 2:11-21 provides us with a synthetic vision of what Paul perceived as the significance of the shared lifeworld at Antioch: the rituals of commensality evidenced nothing less than a visual manifestation of the incorporation of all things into the transformative death and resurrection of Christ; in short, the 'truth of the gospel'. The grace that was shown to Paul in his own call and mediated to the nations through his

⁶³¹ For an extended development of the function of Hab 2:4 in Paul's argument in 2:15-21, see Roy E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 178-220; Watson, "By Faith," 147-63.

⁶³² This has been termed a non-theological use of σάρξ (cf. 2 Cor 10:3) in differentiation from Paul's use of the term for unregenerate life. See Bruce, *Galatians*, 145; E. Schweizer, "νιός," *TDNT* 8.384.

ministry in fulfillment of the Jeremiah new covenant (2:18; cf. 1 Cor 11:25) reconfigured the social world at Antioch in such a way that Christ's salvation in the 'present evil age' was revealed palpably through the bodies of the ritual meal participants. The extent to which such social reconfiguration is disrupted is the extent to which the eschatological revelation of the meals is compromised. As Barclay writes: "The gift enacted in the death of Christ has fundamentally recalibrated the cosmos; that event is either reflected in the norm-breaking practice of communal life or is altogether denied. To re-establish the Torah as the ultimate norm would be to refuse the Gift."⁶³³

7.6. Summary and Conclusions

Paul's depiction of the so-called Antiochene Incident in Gal 2:11-21 afforded us a glimpse of his understanding of the significance of the meal for the Antiochenes formally and Galatians materially. We found that there were two major issues contested by scholars surrounding the content of Gal 2:11-21: first, the extent to which Jewish food prescriptions were followed at the mixed table-fellowship and, secondly, the meaning of 2:15-21 in relation to the three key terms in 2:16: ἔργα νόμου, δικαιοῶ and πίστις Χριστοῦ. As regards the nature and make-up of the mixed-table fellowship, we surveyed two current lines of scholarship, which we termed the *traditional* and *new perspective* proposals, and found that both proposals tended to abstract what Paul calls the 'truth of the gospel' (ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 2:14a) from the Antiochene meal, such that the gospel has a truthfulness apart from its ritualised manifestation. We then challenged this assumption with Rappaport's understanding of the role embodiment plays in establishing or forging social conceptions of 'truth' and 'sanctity'. Following the work of Joseph Bochenski, Rappaport identified two characteristics necessary for the social establishment of the true and unquestionable: what Bochenski called *heuristic* and *obligatory* mechanisms. Heuristic mechanisms involved various strategies by which certain utterances are set apart in a hierarchical fashion from all other competing truth claims and thus rendered 'unquestionable'. The obligatory mechanism involved various strategies by which people demonstrated their acceptance of and thus their obligation to such utterances. Though not explored by Bochenski, Rappaport made the compelling

⁶³³ Barclay, *Paul*, n.p.

argument that ritualisation satisfied these two criteria for the social establishment of truth through the mechanisms of embodiment.

With our ritual theory in place, we explored the significance of the term εὐαγγέλιον in Galatians, and concluded that the ‘gospel’ for Paul was nothing less than a radical reorientation of the world around the Christ-event. Noting that Paul calls this gospel ‘the truth’ (ἀλήθεια, 2:14a), we then looked at Gal 2:11-14 for evidence of heuristic and obligatory mechanisms in the Antiochene rituals of commensality by which the ‘truth of the gospel’ was established. We found that a theme of ‘embodiment’ pervades Paul’s discussion: Paul recounted how he ‘saw’ (εἶδον, cf. 2:7) Peter failing to live in accordance with the truth of the gospel, describing his bodily ‘withdrawal’ from the Gentile table. Further, Paul explained that the Antiochene meals oriented the Jewish body in such a way that one maintained her or his Jewish identity while no longer living in a Jewish manner of life (i.e. following Torah prescriptions). The shared table-fellowship provided a new life-context in which Jewish faithfulness was no longer determined by ‘living as a Jew’ but now by embodying practices revelatory of the ‘truth of the gospel’. We then found obligatory mechanisms, such as Paul’s recounting how Peter had participated recurrently in mixed table-fellowship before the arrival of ‘men from James’, only to ‘withdraw’ from the Gentiles for ‘fear of the circumcision. That Peter’s actions prior to the arrival of ‘men from James’ demonstrated an acceptance of and hence obligation to the truth communicated through the meals was evident in Paul’s denunciation of his actions as ‘condemned’ (κατεγνωσμένος, 2:11) and ‘hypocritical’ (ὑποκρίνομαι, 2:13).

We therefore drew two conclusions: First, because the ‘truth of the gospel’ was what Rappaport referred to as an ‘ultimate sacred postulate’, the ritual meals were not supplemental to the ‘truth of the gospel’; instead, the rituals of commensality were integral to the ritualised *truthfulness* of the gospel, reconstituting reciprocally time and space around the Christ-event. Secondly, we found that the attempts by the ‘new perspective’ proposals to argue that basic Torah prescriptions were being followed by Gentiles on behalf of Jewish sensibilities could not be reconciled with the fact that the meals entailed heuristic and obligatory mechanisms by which the ‘truth of the gospel’ was visually communicated. We thus sided with the traditional interpretation. The meals

at Antioch were norm-breaking rituals of commensality that revealed visually the dawning of the messianic age.

Next, we turned to the various issues surrounding the controverted terms ἔργα νόμου, δικαιοῶ and πίστις Χριστοῦ in 2:16, and found that the embodiment indicators in 2:11-14 do in fact continue into 2:15-21 and thus informed our understanding of the controverted terms. We concluded that (i) ἔργα νόμου denoted a life defined by the embodiment of the Law and thus should not be reduced to denoting a subset of the Law; (ii) δικαιοῶ involved an identification of righteous status before God for those who participate in the rituals of commensality; and (iii) πίστις Χριστοῦ was first and foremost an attribute of the ritualised body, particularly as that body entailed a visually perceived orientation and allegiance toward Christ, thus favoring the objective genitive interpretation of the phrase. We then observed that embodiment indicators informed a *realis* interpretation of 2:17, where Paul acknowledged that those Jews who sought to be justified in Christ (i.e. he and Peter) at Antioch may ‘appear’ (εὐρίσκω) to be ‘sinners’ (ἁμαρτωλοί) in the eyes of some. However, such a perception was valid only if the messianic age as prophesied by Jeremiah and mediated through Paul’s apostolic ministry had not been fulfilled in the Christ-event (2:18). Thus, Peter’s tacit insistence on maintaining pre-messianic social conditions was nothing less than a denial of the dawning of the messianic age through the death and resurrection of Jesus (1:1-4; 2:19-21). Such an age was in fact manifested in the present through a shared lifeworld that had no equal in the wider Jewish world, evidenced in Paul’s own *exemplar* and his five-fold use of ζάω in 2:19-20 in contrast to his ‘death to the Law’ (2:19; cf. 1:13-17). We thus concluded that Paul interpreted the meals at Antioch as nothing less than a visual manifestation of the incorporation of all things in the transformative death and resurrection of Christ; in short, the ‘truth of the gospel’.

Through the application of ritual theory, we were therefore able to see how the Antiochene meals constituted cosmic indicators that revealed a new age where all things were now defined in relation to the Christ-event. The faithful body for the ‘Jew by nature’ was now characterised visually no longer in terms of ‘life as a Jew’ (i.e. ‘works of the Law’) but rather in relation to rituals of consumption in a Christologically-defined shared lifeworld that revealed to the world the ‘truth of the gospel’.

The Logos of the Lord's Supper: 1 Corinthians 8-10

8.1. Introduction

There is a wide consensus among scholars that the fundamental interpretive issue surrounding 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 is that of coherence.⁶³⁴ Since the commentary of Johannes Weiß published in the early twentieth-century, scholars have attempted to reconcile what appears to be a contradiction between Paul's seemingly permissive instructions regarding the eating of idol-food in 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 and his absolute proscription against idolatry and the table of Graeco-Roman gods (τράπεζα δαιμονίων) in 10:1-22.⁶³⁵ There have been thus far two main proposals, what I term the majority and dissenting views, that seek to satisfy the criterion of coherence. The majority view posits that the key to unlocking the coherence for the argument in 8:1-11:1 is discovering the single principle that is common to Paul's permissive instructions and his absolute proscriptions. The dissenting view argues that Paul's so-called permissiveness is specific to the interpretations that make up the majority position and not representative of Paul's views at all.

In what follows, I shall survey both views and demonstrate that the majority position is in fact preferable over the dissenting position. Yet, both proposals tend to marginalise or overlook altogether what I believe to be the paradigmatic role played by the Lord's Supper in 10:16-22 for the intelligibility of this extended pericope. I shall argue that the ritual of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 10:16-22 and 11:17-34 provides a point of integration

⁶³⁴ See, e.g., Derek Newton, *Deity and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth* (JSNTSup 169; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 325; Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 237-40; N. Walter, "Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden," *NTS* 25 (1979): 422-42; Joop Smit, "'Do Not Be Idolaters': Paul's Rhetoric in First Corinthians 10:1-22," *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997): 40-53, 40-2. Stowers, "Elusive Coherence," 68, calls coherence the "leitmotif" of current contributions.

⁶³⁵ Johannes Weiß argued that 1 Corinthians 8-10 was actually a composite of portions from different Pauline letters, known as the partition theory. Weiß posited that 10:1-22 belonged to a previous letter sent to the Corinthians (cf. 5:9), which banned outright the eating of idol foods, reflecting Paul's Jewish sensibilities. However, 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 reflect a later more conciliatory Pauline perspective that is in basic agreement with the position of the so-called Strong (see below). See *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 212-3, 264. Cf. Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 23-4; John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1* (WUNT II 151; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 1-4; idem, "The Rhetorical Situation, Arrangement, and Argumentation of 1 Corinthians 8:1-13: Insights into Paul's Instructions on Idol-Food in Greco-Roman Context," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 47:1-4 (2002): 165-98, 165-6.

for the complex of elements comprising 1 Cor 8:1-11:1. To that end, I shall first examine the cosmological significance of ritualised processes as explicated by the work of Rappaport. I shall then examine how the ritualised composite of cosmology and social order has been understood to foster subjective dispositions in the work of Pierre Bourdieu and his theory of habitus. The habitus constituted by a socially and spatially informed body reproduces a social order the rules, norms and understandings of which are derivative of the shared cosmic orders disclosed in socially-defining rituals. I shall then examine the text of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 in light of this ritual theory, in order to determine the extent to which the Lord's Supper in 10:16-22 is paradigmatic for the discussion of food sacrificed to idols in 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 on the one hand, and the proscription against idolatry in 10:1-22 on the other, thus satisfying the criterion for coherence.

8.2. Coherence and the Corinthian Correspondence

What follows from the phrase *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* in 8:1a is a series of statements the logic of which has been most perplexing for scholars. Why does Paul affirm *οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἴς*, a development of his previous statement in 8:1b, *οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκοντες ἔχομεν*, only to explicitly refute such a claim in 8:7a: *Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γινώσκεις* (cf. 15:34)? And why does Paul deny the existence of idols in v. 4 only to interpret idol worship as a partnership with demons (*κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων*) in 10:20?⁶³⁶

There have been several proposals to account for the perplexing logic of Paul's discourse. A number of scholars interpret Paul as quoting from portions of a previous letter he received from the Corinthians. In this case, Paul is rhetorically refuting positions represented by the Strong. It is almost universally agreed with respect to *πάντα ἔξεστιν* (10:23; cf. also 6:12) that Paul is quoting from a letter sent by the Corinthians, but some scholars see phrases throughout chapter 8, such as vv. 1a, 4, 5 (with possible Pauline qualifications), 6 and 8, as most likely originating from the Strong.⁶³⁷ Others have

⁶³⁶ cf. John Fotopoulos, "Arguments Concerning Food Offered to Idols: Corinthian Quotations and Pauline Refutations in a Rhetorical *Partitio* (1 Corinthians 8:1-9)," *CBQ* (2005): 611-31, 613; idem, *Food*, 209.

⁶³⁷ See, e.g. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:220-21; Fotopoulos, "Arguments," 618-31; idem, *Food*, 209-20; Peter David Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*, (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993), 61-3, 67-70; Wendell Willis, "1 Corinthians 8-10: A Retrospective After Twenty-Five Years," *ResQ* 49.2 (2007): 103-12, 106; Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 136, 38-9.

approached 1 Corinthians 8 from the vantage point of rhetorical theory. Mitchell argues that Paul is attempting to accommodate two mutually exclusive positions (the eating of idol food while condemning idolatry) as part of his larger rhetoric of reconciliation.⁶³⁸ Smit proposes that 8:4-6 along with 10:1-22 represent Paul's *theological* argument (the effect eating idol food has on the Corinthians' relationship to God) while 8:1-3 and 8:7-9:27 constitute his *social* argument (the effect that such meals have on fellow believers).⁶³⁹ Yeo posits that the content of 9:24-10:22 reflects Jewish halakhic concerns that address practical issues in relation to a teacher or leader, while 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 comprise a response to a more general situation and stress a rhetoric of knowledge and love.⁶⁴⁰

While some scholars, like Weiß, simply find Paul or the text to be incoherent,⁶⁴¹ there are to date two main proposals for the intelligibility of Paul's argument. The first proposal, the majority position, argues that Paul is in general agreement with the so-called 'Strong': they do have a right or privilege (ἐξουσία) to eat food sacrificed to idols, since idol-food is adiaphoron in light of the advent of Christ. The Strong, however, should take into consideration those Paul terms the 'Weak' (ἀσθενής) whose consciences (συνήθεια) may be adversely affected, since they consider the eating of idol-food to be equivalent to the worship of other gods (8:7-12).⁶⁴² The evidence for this position involves the following. First, Paul is in basic agreement with the position outlined in 8:1, 4, 6, and 8. Even if Paul is quoting aphorisms representative of the Corinthian Strong's

⁶³⁸ Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 238.

⁶³⁹ Joop Smit, "Do Not Be Idolaters," 42, a distinction I find overly subtle and unnecessary.

⁶⁴⁰ Khiok-Khng Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 81, 156-211.

⁶⁴¹ Hence his partition theory, a variation of which has been most recently advocated by Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction*. On Paul's supposed inconsistency, see Stowers, "Elusive Coherence," 77-8.

⁶⁴² Willis, "Retrospective," 111, observes that there is scholarly unanimity in designating what Paul terms ἀσθενής, the 'Weak', "as simply those who are troubled by the eating of sacrificial meat and whose unity is found only in that anxiety." Cf. Wendell Lee Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 92; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 640-44. There is no actual party named the 'Strong'. This is a term commonly used in scholarship to designate that group who constitute the opposite of those Paul terms ἀσθενής (cf. the two groups δυνατός and ἀδύνατος in Rom 15:1) (Fotopoulos, *Food*, 2 n.3; Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority: A Study in 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora* [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 3). Some scholars see the 'Weak' and 'Strong' as a purely hypothetical scenario, with no actual correspondence to the demographics of the Corinthian community, but this proposal remains questionable. See John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., *The Origins of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), 123-5, 147-8; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 65-7, 83-4, 97, 108. On the rejection of this hypothesis by the majority of scholars, see David G. Horrell, "Theological Principle or Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1," *JSNT* 67 (1997): 84-5; Phua, *Idolatry*, 2-3.

position, he offers little to no disagreement with the basic premise of these postulates summarised in the monotheistic confession of 8:4b-6: idols do not exist because the cosmos is related to and sustained by only one God.⁶⁴³ Secondly, Paul's statement in 8:8 puts forward the basic premise for determining eating practices: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν, implying that idol-food belongs to the category of adiaphora.⁶⁴⁴ Thirdly, while Paul addresses food sacrificed to idols (εἰδωλόθυτα) in 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1, in 10:1-22 Paul is dealing with the issue of 'idolatry' (εἰδωλολατρία) which he absolutely forbids. The different contexts satisfy the coherence of Paul's permissiveness for one occasion and absolute prohibition for the other.⁶⁴⁵

The second proposal, which has been increasingly accepted in light of several recent studies, is that Paul without qualification rejects the Strong's ἐξουσία in 8:1-13 and proscribes absolutely all temple meals.⁶⁴⁶ First, there appears to be an inescapable ambiguity with the traditional interpretation, namely, where does one draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable temple events? What precisely constitutes an idolatrous cultic feast (10:21) and a mere temple meal (8:10)?⁶⁴⁷ Secondly, Paul refutes unequivocally the Strong's conception of knowledge (γνῶσις) in vv. 1c-3, which is the foundation of their ἐξουσία.⁶⁴⁸ Thirdly, the adiaphoric aphorism in 8:8 is not Paul's, but the Corinthians', and one that he clearly rejects in 10:1-23.⁶⁴⁹ As one deeply rooted in Jewish sensibilities, it is unthinkable that Paul would consider the eating of idol-food as adiaphora.⁶⁵⁰ Fourthly, Paul most certainly does disagree with the basic premise of the

⁶⁴³ C.K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," *NTS* XI (1964-65): 196-216, 150-2; idem, *First Epistle*, 240, who comments regarding Paul's orientation: "So far as the essential point of principle is concerned, he is at one with the strong Christians (cf. Rom xv. I); neither food nor abstention from it will commend us to God." Cf. Bruce N. Fisk, "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8-10," *TrinJ* 10:1 (1989): 49-70, 67.

⁶⁴⁴ See, e.g., Meeks, *First Urban*, 97-100.

⁶⁴⁵ Fisk, "Eating Meat," 55-64; Horrell, "Idol-Food," 125-7.

⁶⁴⁶ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 208-23; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 86; A.T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 128, 296.

⁶⁴⁷ Cheung, *Idol Food*, 94.

⁶⁴⁸ Fotopoulos, "Rhetorical Situation," 181-87.

⁶⁴⁹ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 216-18; idem, "Rhetorical Situation," 185-6.

⁶⁵⁰ Fotopoulos, "Rhetorical Situation," 168-9; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 76-81, 108-9; Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 185, 195-6, 201-3, 206-8, 219-20, 275-6; James D.G. Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 701-6.

Strong in 8:4b-5: idols are in fact demonic (10:19-22) and thus they are to have nothing to do with them.⁶⁵¹ Paul is clearly not indifferent to the eating of idol food.

As will be developed below, the dissenting proposal offers an important corrective to the majority view: idol food was not indifferent to Paul. Nevertheless, the dissenting proposal suffers from significant flaws. First, proponents of this interpretation tend to root Paul's conception of food in a distinctly Jewish cosmology.⁶⁵² The problem here is that such a view is contradicted by the cosmology of 8:6. For Paul and the Corinthians, Jewish cosmology rooted in one God the Father ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα is now manifested by and inseparable from one Lord Jesus Christ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. Thus, Paul's cosmology is *like* yet very much *unlike* Jewish cosmology, such that an appeal to Jewish cosmology alone is simply not decisive for Paul's conception of food.⁶⁵³

Secondly, no matter how one appropriates quotations in 8:1, 4-6, 8, Paul is in basic agreement with the positions outlined in chapter 8, though he may qualify them sharply and correct their erroneous implications for conduct.⁶⁵⁴ Most pointedly, I am simply unconvinced that the general principle in 8:8, βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν, is challenged by Paul in any significant way, and certainly not in the manner reflective of Jewish sensibilities.⁶⁵⁵ This is corroborated by passages such as 9:20-22 and 10:32, which appear perfectly consistent with the general principle of 8:8. The issue is stated succinctly by David Horrell: "Had Paul meant plainly to prohibit the eating of idol-food he could have done so quite simply, thus making his instruction on the matter clear to the Corinthians and other early Christians."⁶⁵⁶ The simple fact of the matter is that nowhere in 1 Cor 8:1-

⁶⁵¹ Fotopoulos, "Rhetorical Situation," 185-6; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 119-20.

⁶⁵² Fotopoulos, "Rhetorical Situation," 167-9.

⁶⁵³ On Paul's innovative monotheism, see Hurtado, *One God*, 17-92; cf. James Constantine Hanges, *Christ, the Image of the Church: The Construction of a New Cosmology and the Rise of Christianity* (Aurora, CO: The Davies Group, 2006).

⁶⁵⁴ Horrell, "Theological Principle," 86. So, too, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 628f; Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 193f; Fee, *First Epistle*, 372; Willis, "Retrospective," 106.

⁶⁵⁵ So, too, John M.G. Barclay, "Food, Christian Identity and Global Warming: A Pauline Call for a Christian Food Taboo," *The Expository Times* 121 (12) (2010): 585-93, 587; E. Coyle Still, "Paul's Aims Regarding ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ: A New Proposal for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1," *Novum Testamentum* XLIV 4 (2002):333-43, 335. For a detailed critique of the proposals of Tomson, Cheung, et al, see Seyoon Kim, "Imitatio Christi (1 Corinthians 11:1): How Paul Imitates Jesus Christ in Dealing with Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10)," *BBR* 13.2 (2003): 193-226.

⁶⁵⁶ David G. Horrell, "Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul," in Stephen C. Barton (ed.), *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 120-40, 124.

13 or 10:23-11:1 does Paul explicitly forbid the eating of idol-food *because* it is idol-food. On the contrary, as will be argued below, Paul could ban all idol-food consumption outright and yet the fundamental problem among the Corinthians would still persist. Idol-food is thus an indicator of a deeper issue that is the object of Paul's concern.

Thirdly, in order for the logic of the argument in 1 Corinthians 9 to make sense, what the Strong are asked to give up (their ἐξουσία) must be legitimate.⁶⁵⁷ For we find that in 9:12, 18-22 and 10:23, Paul's practice of waiving his apostolic right to financial support was in fact a lived-out embodiment of the ethical principle of self-giving love outlined in 8:1-3.⁶⁵⁸ Paul thus *voluntarily* foregoes his own prerogatives that he might be a slave to all (9:19), an *exemplum* he explicitly exhorts the Strong to follow (11:1).

Fourthly, scholars who advocate Paul's proscription of all temple meals tend to equate the term εἰδωλοθύτων (idol food) with εἰδωλολατρία (idolatry).⁶⁵⁹ The work of Derek Newton has demonstrated that ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον (8:10) refers to a spectrum of activities that did not necessarily entail participating in the cultic act of sacrifice itself.⁶⁶⁰ As Fisk corroborates, eating εἰδωλόθυστα means eating food (formerly) sacrificed to idols, of which Paul asks rhetorically with the implied negative: εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν;⁶⁶¹ Newton goes on to argue that 10:1-22 deals with a different situation, namely, εἰδωλολατρία, the direct participation among members of the Corinthian community in the sacrificial rituals which was a position that carried great honour and prestige in Graeco-Roman society.⁶⁶² Thus, "1 Corinthians 8 dealt with the issue of temple *eating*, whereas 1 Cor 10:1-22 tackled the problem of actual sacrificial acts accompanied by eating."⁶⁶³ From this vantage point, Paul agrees with the Strong: the

⁶⁵⁷ Still, "Paul's Aims," 334-6; Horrell, "Theological Principle," 90.

⁶⁵⁸ Hafemann, *Suffering*, 127-8, 135-7.

⁶⁵⁹ Cheung, *Idol Food*, 28-32. Cheung goes on to comment on 10:19-20: "Paul is making clear the nature of εἰδωλόθυτόν: to eat εἰδωλόθυτόν is to participate in εἰδωλολατρία" (147). Fotopoulos, *Food*, 233, writes: "In v 14 Paul has arrived at his central refutation of the Corinthians' idol-food consumption constituting idolatry." So, too, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 166-7; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 464; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 224.

⁶⁶⁰ Cf. Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 197-202, 228-31, 233-9. See, too, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 17-64, who documents the sociological significance of temple dining.

⁶⁶¹ Fisk, "Eating Meat," 58.

⁶⁶² Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 338.

⁶⁶³ Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 198-9. Newton observes further: "The act of sacrificial offering was thus in one sense a 'minor' event, relative to the number of people at the feast and to the total amount of meat actually consumed by those people" (202). Cf. Fisk, "Eating Meat," 63-4, who sees the problem in terms of Christian κοινωνία with pagans at the temple. So, too, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 191-2.

idol, being impotent, threatens no adverse effect on either food or consumer, and can thereby be consumed apart from the immediate context of the officials of the cult.⁶⁶⁴ Whatever the ambiguity, therefore, the traditional interpretation is correct in locating the resolution to the apparent incoherence of this pericope in uncovering the principle common to both Paul's permission and his proscription. Permitted and proscribed eating are thus indicators of a more foundational concern on Paul's part.

However, uncovering the coherence of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 involves more than accounting for Paul's permission and proscription. Indeed, it is not altogether clear how the arrogance of the Strong in 8:1 relates to the problems stemming from their eating practices, or how such arrogance relates to Paul's own life as *exemplar* in 9:1-27 and his concern over idolatry in 10:1-22. Further, how do Paul's references to cosmology fit into the overall argument? Even if we affirm that 8:6 is a Corinthian slogan, Paul does little to correct it, and in fact seems to affirm it by citing Ps 24(LXX 23):1 in 10:26 (cf. 10:31). It appears, then, that we need to find a principle common not only to Paul's permission and proscription, but one that is able to assimilate eating practices, dispositions and cosmology as well.

One area that has thus far been overlooked by scholars in determining the principle common to Paul's permission and proscription is the role of the Lord's Supper in 10:16-22 as the foundry for such an all-encompassing principle. Below I shall explicate Rappaport's theory on the totalising significance of ritual, where the performance of rituals imposes an order upon the world such that cosmic orders are made in correspondence to the complex representations of liturgical orders in their entirety. I shall then expand such explication with Pierre Bourdieu's conception of *habitus* in order to illuminate how ritually produced cosmologies are reproduced in social practices such as eating and reflected in the formation of socially-influenced dispositions. As we shall develop below, the importance of this ritual theory for our text is that it provides an explanatory model that connects the several factors that appear in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, namely, eating practices, dispositions and cosmologies.

8.3. Ritual and Cosmology: The Formation of a Liturgical Logos

⁶⁶⁴ Fisk, "Eating Meat," 59; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 234.

Our exploration of ritual theory has thus far uncovered a number of social and cultural orders and dimensions that are forged in ritualised processes. Among these have been a distinct sense of time, the creation of the sacred, the establishment of social order and ethical obligation. Taken together, these dimensions or frames of reference constitute a cosmology, or what Rappaport terms a ‘Logos’.⁶⁶⁵ Rappaport uses the term ‘Logos’ to designate the fact that such orders and dimensions are partly natural and partly constructed through ritually established conventions. The performance of rituals imposes an order upon the world such that cosmic orders “are made in correspondence to the complex representations of liturgical orders in their entirety.”⁶⁶⁶ Rituals do not direct participants on how to organise and conduct the various institutions, regulations and authorities that constitute social order; instead, they disclose a distinct cosmology or Logos that certifies and legitimates those institutions, regulations and authorities. Rituals in effect bind together into a single coherent whole the natural with the cultural, the individual with the group, the discursive and the non-discursive, and thus constitute a particular vision of reality. Through ritualised processes, certain acts, utterances, beliefs and practices become *as natural* as the natural world around us, and thus the culture that flows out of ritualised processes is taken for granted as natural and normal. Rappaport notes that such divinely ordained cosmic orders “provide criteria in terms of which actions, events, words, ideas and even conventions may be judged and found proper, good, true, ‘in order’ or erroneous, evil, false, ‘out of order’.”⁶⁶⁷ In other words, because the Logos (ritual complex) possesses qualities concomitant with natural law it also possesses moral force, in that the Logos is able to distinguish between which behaviours are natural and normal and which are not. As we have seen (cf. 2.2; 4.3.3), this moral force is the result of the act of acceptance by ritual participants: by participating in the acts and utterances constitutive of a ritually disclosed world, the participants demonstrate the acceptance of and hence obligation to that world. The human body, as the location of acceptance, therefore develops a *sense* of what is natural and normal in terms of cosmic assumptions and social and cultural practices.

⁶⁶⁵ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 344-70.

⁶⁶⁶ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 346.

⁶⁶⁷ *Ritual*, 346.

8.4. Cosmology and Habitus: The Socially Inscribed Body

According to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, the location for the reproduction and perpetuation of this cosmic and moral normalcy as social convention is the human body. Bourdieu argues that the human body situated within a social order both reflects and reproduces dynamically that order. The key agent for this reflection and reproduction is what Bourdieu terms ‘habitus’, a system of “durable, transposable dispositions” that are informed, literally *informed*, through social interaction and thus encode and inscribe cultural meaning and understanding upon the human body.⁶⁶⁸ Human dispositions for Bourdieu involve “an internal law through which the law of external necessities ... is constantly exerted.”⁶⁶⁹ This internal law involves norms, habits, rules, understandings and goals that constitute a social order comprised of multiple fields of activities (hence they are “transposable”). The important insight offered by Bourdieu is that these dispositions are not learned abstractly or intellectually but rather through the unconscious inculcation of objective social conditions inherent in bodily postures, gesticulations and rules of etiquette.⁶⁷⁰ The social inscription entailed in various reciprocal practices produces dispositions that are homologous to the social conditions through which they are acquired.⁶⁷¹ Thus, the dispositions of human persons are always structured and structuring; they are produced by the rules, understandings, and goals inherent in the practices constitutive of the larger social order on the one hand, while, on the other hand, the socially inscribed dispositions provide a range of options for the actor to choose from that are appropriate to any given situation. Together with Rappaport’s theory, the point here is that the habitus constituted by a socially and spatially informed body maintains through somatic reproduction a social order the rules, norms and understandings of which are derivative of the shared cosmic orders disclosed in socially-defining rituals. The constituent elements of a ritualised cosmology are manifested in the reflecting and reproducing ritualised body.

8.5. Social Practice, Disposition and Cosmology: 1 Cor 8:1-13

⁶⁶⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 53.

⁶⁶⁹ *Logic of Practice*, 54.

⁶⁷⁰ *Logic of Practice*, 53-4.

⁶⁷¹ *Logic of Practice*, 97.

With the foregoing ritual theory in place, we shall proceed with our investigation of this complex extended pericope by first investigating Paul's concerns in 1 Corinthians 8:1-13, which consists of a three-fold contrast of interrelated complexes: i) two different eating practices which structure and are structured by ii) two different subjective dispositions or orientations which are related homologously to iii) two different cosmologies. We shall then account for these contrasts by exploring how they converge in two incompatible rituals that disclose their respective cosmologies: the *τράπεζα κυρίου* and the *τράπεζα δαιμονίων* (10:16-22). In order to get a fuller understanding of the *τράπεζα κυρίου* as a liturgical Logos, we shall supplement 10:16-22 with Paul's extended discussion of the ritual meal in 11:17-34. Finally, we shall explain Paul's concerns, particularly his permission and proscription, in light of the two dispositions fundamental to the ritualised disclosure of a Christocentric cosmology: *thanksgiving* and *self-giving*. I shall argue that the Strong, in arrogantly influencing their weaker brothers to eat that for which they cannot give thanks, embody a habitus that in fact betrays the very Christocentric cosmology by which such eating practices are justified. By understanding 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1 as a contrast between two ritually revealed cosmologies governed by two incompatible practical dispositions, we shall find that the criterion for coherence is satisfied.

8.5.1. Two Contrasting Social Practices: Feasting and Abstaining

The first contrast that we see in this extended pericope is a contrast between two different eating practices. Paul begins the pericope in 8:1a with the phrase *περὶ δέ* which, in light of its use in 7:1, 25; 12:1; 16:1, 12, is understood by scholars as providing "in some way the key to the structure and composition of the letter."⁶⁷² Against the backdrop of the wider Graeco-Roman epistolary tradition, Mitchell has argued convincingly that the phrase is simply a "topic marker, a shorthand way of introducing the next subject of discussion" (cf. 8:4).⁶⁷³ The topic at hand in 8:1a involves *τὰ εἰδωλόθута*, a compound of

⁶⁷² M.M. Mitchell, "Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians," *NovT* 31 (1989): 229-56, citing, *inter alia*, Barrett, *First Epistle*, 154; Fee, *First Epistle*, 267; F.F. Bruce, *I and II Corinthians*, New Century Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), 24, 66.

⁶⁷³ Mitchell, "Concerning," 234, further noting that the new topic would have been familiar to both author and reader. Mitchell is responding to past scholarship that sees *περὶ δέ* as providing information about the order of topics as they came to Paul in a previous letter from Corinth, as well as proposals that interpreted Paul's other uses of *περὶ δέ* in 1 Corinthians in light of his first use of the phrase in 7:1.

εἰδωλον ('idol') and θύω ('to sacrifice' / 'to offer') seemingly specific to Paul, though, in light of 7:1, it may have been part of the letter sent to Paul previously by the Corinthians.⁶⁷⁴ We find that Paul further refines the topic in 8:4a, which is linked to 8:1a by the topic marker περί (cf. 8:1a) and the inferential οὖν ('therefore'), followed by the genitival phrase τῆς βρώσεως ... τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων.⁶⁷⁵ The term βρῶσις is a verbal noun meaning 'the actual eating of food'.⁶⁷⁶ Thus the issue addressed by Paul centers on the practice of eating sacrificial food.⁶⁷⁷

Recent studies confirm that a wide variety of foods and drinks were used in sacrificial contexts, such as meat (bull, ox, lamb, pork, goat), poultry, fish, grain, cakes, figs, honey, oil, wine and milk.⁶⁷⁸ There are a handful of indicators in the text that suggest that this food variety is well within Paul's parameters of interest. First, Paul refers to περὶ τῆς βρώσεως ... τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (concerning the eating of food offered to idols) in 8:4a, which is mirrored by his concern over any 'food' (βρῶμα) that could cause another to stumble (σκανδαλίζω) in 8:13a. Secondly, he references libations with his proscription of 'drinking of the cup of demons' (οὐ δύνασθε ... πίνειν ... ποτήριον δαιμονίων) in 10:21. Thirdly, Paul's instructions regarding table etiquette in the context of domestic meals in Graeco-Roman homes in 10:27-11:1 by its nature involves a wide array of foods and drinks.⁶⁷⁹ And, fourthly, we should not overlook that Paul concludes this extended pericope with a reference to all foods and drinks (εἴτε οὖν ἐσθίετε εἴτε πίνετε) in 10:31.

However, there are indicators that Paul is deeply concerned about meat in particular.⁶⁸⁰ First, he narrows his concern over 'food' with a reference to 'meat' (κρέας) in 8:13b. Secondly, there is the allusion to the sacrificial meat eaten by priests at the Jewish altar (9:13). Thirdly, there is the reference to Israel's rebellion in the wilderness in 10:5-11, where the desire for eating meat is the cause of their rebellion against God (Num

⁶⁷⁴ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 208; Horrell, "Theological Principle," 85. Witherington notes that the term does not appear in Graeco-Roman or Jewish literature prior to Paul. See Ben Witherington, "Not So Idle Thoughts about *Eidolothuton*," *Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993): 237-54; so, too, Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:236; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 319; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 364.

⁶⁷⁵ Fee, *First Epistle*, 370, refers to v. 4a as "repeating" v. 1a and "returning to the topic at hand."

⁶⁷⁶ Fee, *First Epistle*, 370 n.5; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 210; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 371.

⁶⁷⁷ Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 135: "One key to following Paul's argument is to recognize that he is primarily addressing the problem of sacrificial food consumed in the temple of the pagan god (8.10; 10.14, 21)" (emphasis original).

⁶⁷⁸ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 63-4; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 175-257; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 53-5, 149-50.

⁶⁷⁹ Cf. Fotopoulos, *Food*, 208.

⁶⁸⁰ The anxiety over meat is explored in detail by Stowers, "Elusive Coherence," 74-9.

11:4), 10-13).⁶⁸¹ Fourthly, Paul's instructions regarding the purchasing of food at the *macellum* in 10:25-6 would have been concerned with what was chiefly sold there, namely meat.⁶⁸²

Paul begins his discussion of idol foods with the aphorism in 8:1b, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινῶσιν ἔχομεν ('we know that we all have knowledge'). It has been observed that in Hellenistic Jewish literature, γινῶσις connotes the act of knowing as well as the object of knowledge, such as the 'knowledge of God' (Wisd. 15:2-3; Philo, *Fug.* 165; *Deus* 143), the 'knowledge of truth' (*Prob.* 74), or 'knowledge of holy things' (Wisd. 10:10).⁶⁸³ Γινῶσις is thus indicative of a subjective orientation or status toward an eternal or divine reality, and is by implication inextricably soteriological.⁶⁸⁴ However, what should not be overlooked is that Paul links γινῶσις to the actual eating of foods (βρωσις) sacrificed to idols (cf. 8:1a with 8:4, 7). The important observation here is that Paul references not merely a conceptual knowledge but also a *practical* knowledge, one that is acquired through practice and corporeality in the act of eating. Thus the γινῶσις of the Strong is reflective of what Aristotle termed φρόνησις or 'practical thought/ knowledge' (*Eth. nic.* 1142a24-31).

In the context of 8:1-6, the γινῶσις of the Strong involves a distinctly cosmic understanding embedded in their eating practices, namely, because idols do not actually exist they are free to eat food sacrificed to them (8:4b). However, Paul in v. 7 qualifies (ἀλλά) the universality of *this* practical knowledge (taking the ἡ preceding γινῶσις as a demonstrative)⁶⁸⁵ in vv. 1, 4b-6 by observing that not all share this knowledge (οὐκ ἐν παντί). Rather, there are some who believe that βρωσις τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων involves nothing less than the continued participation in a profane world constituted by idols (τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν), and, as such, their συνείδησις, which Paul describes as ἀσθενής, is concomitantly 'profaned' or 'defiled'

⁶⁸¹ Stowers, "Elusive Coherence," 77-8.

⁶⁸² Bruce Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 293-5.

⁶⁸³ Richard A. Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6," *NTS* 27 (1979): 32-51, 34. Horsley argues that the γινῶσις of the Corinthian Strong is actually related to their obsession with σοφία in accordance with Hellenistic Jewish theology that Paul dealt with in 1 Corinthians 1-4. The problem with his thesis, however, is that Paul agrees with the γινῶσις of the Corinthians while he remains quite critical of their σοφία (cf. Phua, *Idolatry*, 129).

⁶⁸⁴ Horsley, "Gnosis," 34.

⁶⁸⁵ P.D. Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 40.

(μολύνω).⁶⁸⁶ The perspective of the Weak appears to reflect an important dimension of our analysis, which involves understanding how practices, particularly eating practices, interrelate with one another into a sort of social nexus. In her influential essay, “Deciphering a Meal,” Mary Douglas observes that meals are related syntagmatically to one another; that is, each meal derives its meaning from its contiguous relationship to other meals. The range of meanings that span across variegated meals is circumscribed by the most important member of the aliment series. This most important member of meal nexus constitutes what Douglas refers to as the ‘paradigmatic meal’, the meal in relation to which the chain of dietary contiguity derives its meaning.⁶⁸⁷ For example, the composition of the Sunday dinner has defined traditionally what constitutes an evening meal throughout the week in the western world. Thus each individual meal metonymically figures a meta-defining paradigmatic meal. This syntagmatic-paradigmatic arrangement corroborates Rappaport’s observation that rituals impose a cosmology, an order, upon the world that is largely determinative of what is considered culturally natural and normative. This paradigmatic-syntagmatic relationship thus anticipates Paul’s contrast between the *τράπεζα κυρίου* and the *τράπεζα δαιμονίων* in 10:14-22 which he will use as a way of orienting syntagmatic eating relationships dealt with in 8:1-13 and in 10:23-11:1. For now, Douglas’ paradigm can help us to appreciate how the Weak cannot disassociate eating food sacrificed to idols from participating in the cultic act of sacrifice itself (i.e. that is, for them, the paradigmatic meal).

In light of the Weak’s inability to participate in eating idol-food in good conscience, Paul advocates an alternative practice in v. 13, where he concludes that if eating causes anyone to fall, may he never eat meat again.⁶⁸⁸ Paul develops this ‘freedom to abstain’ in 1 Corinthians 9, where Paul’s warning in 8:9 that the Strong are not to use their rights as a stumbling block to the Weak is lived out by Paul’s own example in 9:12, 18-22 (cf. 10:33).⁶⁸⁹ For there we see that Paul’s forgoing his own right to apostolic support

⁶⁸⁶ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 215; Fee *First Corinthians*, 379-80; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 639.

⁶⁸⁷ Douglas, “Deciphering a Meal,” 260.

⁶⁸⁸ The hypothetical nature of the statement, in my view, renders the question over whether Paul’s reference to ‘meat’ (κρέας) involves his own participation in temple meals irrelevant. As Paul will make clear in 10:31, his concern is over ‘all foods and drinks’ (εἴτε ... ἐσθίετε εἴτε πίνετε εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε). On the discussion, see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 150 n.42; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 222, Cheung, *Idol Food*, 137-8.

⁶⁸⁹ On Paul’s freedom to fast, see Gardner, *Gifts*, 48-53. This interpretation therefore finds that 1 Corinthians 9, far from an interpolation or interruption of the flow of the argument in chapters 8 and 10, is indeed fully consistent with the context of Paul’s argument. 1 Corinthians 9 has been considered by some

functions as an embodiment of the ethical principle of love-controlled freedom, a freedom that breaks down all hindrances to the gospel.⁶⁹⁰ And his call for the Corinthians to ‘become without offense to the Jews and Gentiles and the Church of God’ in 10:32 (cf. 10:24) is an outworking of his own practice of becoming ‘to the Jews as a Jew, to those under the Law as under the Law, to those apart from the Law as apart from the Law’ (9:20-22). Thus the Corinthians are to imitate Paul as he imitates Christ (11:1).

8.5.2. Two Contrasting Dispositions: Arrogance and Love

The second interrelated contrast in Paul’s argument is between two incompatible subjective dispositions or orientations embedded in the eating practices. We noted above that social practices shape subjective dispositions concomitant with the practices, such that human dispositions reflect and reproduce dynamically the objective social order inculcated upon the body. It is therefore of interest that Paul qualifies the aphorism in 8:1b with a contrast (δέ) between γνῶσις and ἀγάπη, each of which entails a different attribute: while γνῶσις φυσιοῖ (‘puffs up’), ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ (‘builds up’).⁶⁹¹ Against the contrasting term οἰκοδομέω, the term φυσιοῖ has the sense of conflict ‘against one another’ (cf. 1 Cor 14:3: ἀγάπη οὐ φυσιοῦται).⁶⁹² Thus, the Corinthians’ γνῶσις entails for Paul an embodied disposition akin to arrogance that significantly affects the unity of the Corinthian community. Paul contrasts this adverse disposition with that entailed in ἀγάπη, namely, οἰκοδομέω, which has as its consideration or goal not one’s own needs but rather the needs of others (cf. 1 Cor 14:26 with 14:4-5, 12, 17, 19; 10:23b; Rom 14:20). That Paul is not contrasting ‘knowledge’ and ‘love’ per se is evident in the next verse, where Paul proposes that εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνώκῃ τι, οὐπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι. Rather, the Corinthian Strong’s γνῶσις lacks the virtue of ἀγάπη. As Newton notes:

interpreters a digression from Paul’s argument in the form of an apostolic ἀπολογία, where Paul is defending himself against charges discrediting his apostolicity (cf. Barrett, *First Epistle*, 200; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 152; Fee, *First Epistle*, 392-441; Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. J.H. Schultz [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982], 40-54). But Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 244, is correct in observing that “all attempts to analyze 1 Cor 9 as a true defense against actual charges have failed” (so, too, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 110-1).

⁶⁹⁰ Hafemann, *Suffering*, 126-7.

⁶⁹¹ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 71. Horrell, “Theological Principle,” 86 n.12 observes that φυσιοῖ appears only in 1 Corinthians (cf. 4:6, 18, 19; 5:2; 13:4) and once in Colossians (2:18), and always in a pejorative sense; so, too, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 73.

⁶⁹² Willis, *Idol Meat*, 73-4.

“Knowledge claimed by the Corinthians ... is not that knowledge which they ought to have... ‘Love’ and ‘knowledge’ go hand-in-hand and are inextricably intertwined.”⁶⁹³

We noted above that Paul in v. 7 qualifies the γνώσις of the Strong by observing that not all share this knowledge (οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν). There are those who, while convinced that βρωσις τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων involves nothing less than idolatry, are nevertheless ironically ‘built up’ (οικοδομέω) to participate in the eating of idol food by virtue of the Strong’s example, resulting in their profaning their συνείδησις (vv. 7-8). The term συνείδησις, being virtually without precedent in the LXX, is translated generally in terms of its use in Greek philosophy as ‘self-awareness’, ‘moral consciousness’, or ‘conscience’.⁶⁹⁴ The term ἀσθενής is usually translated as ‘weak’ as in ‘without strength’ or ‘feeble’ (cf. see above), and is almost universally interpreted by scholars as a reference to fellow Christians who are troubled by the eating of sacrificial food and yet are tempted to eat of it by virtue of the Strong’s example.⁶⁹⁵ The Weak have been understood by scholars as a group within the Corinthian body characterised by a low economic status and who are thus unaccustomed to eating meat outside of a cultic context. The Strong, on the other hand, have been interpreted as having an economic advantage which entailed the eating of meat with some frequency, particularly in relation to business deals in Graeco-Roman economic life.⁶⁹⁶ Justin Meggitt, however, has argued that meat was far more accessible

⁶⁹³ Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 277; cf. Horrell, “Theological Principle,” 86. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 80, notes that ‘to be known by God’ (8:3) has the connotation of divine election of God’s people (Gen 18:19; Exod 37:12; Amos 3:2; Hos 13:5).

⁶⁹⁴ Maurer, C. “συνείδησις,” *TDNT* 7.898-918, who notes that of the 14 uses of the term by Paul, eight deal with food sacrificed to idols (cf. 1 Cor 8:7-13; 10:25-30; cf. Rom 2:5; 9:1; 13:5; 1 Cor 8:7, 10, 12; 10:25, 27, 28, 29; 2 Cor 1:12; 4:2 and 5:11; cf. Willis, *Idol Meat* 89). Horrell, “Idol-Food,” 123-4, understands συνείδησις in terms of self-awareness or moral consciousness. Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 640-44 provides an overview of past research on the significance of the term συνείδησις in relation to the philosophical schools, Stoicism and Hellenistic Judaism. See, too, BAGD 786; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 215; Richard A. Horsley, “Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8-10,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 581-89; Paul W. Gooch, “‘Conscience’ in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 244-54.

⁶⁹⁵ Willis, “Restrospective,” 11. There is a general agreement among scholars that the Weak were Gentile Christians (see, e.g., Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 147; Fee, *First Epistle*, 378; Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 141), although Phua, *Idolatry*, 4, notes that we can’t be certain on this. Mark Nanos argues that the term ἀσθενής refers not to fellow Christians but to polytheist idolaters with whom Christians in Corinth interact, but only by unsuccessfully arguing that the term ἀδελφός (vv. 11-13) as used by Paul extends to non-Christians. See Mark D. Nanos, “The Polytheist Identity of the ‘Weak’, and Paul’s Strategy to ‘Gain’ Them: A New Reading of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1,” in Stanley, Porter (ed.), *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman* (Pauline Studies, Vol. 5; Boston, Brill Academic Publishers, 2009), 179-210, esp. 203-9.

⁶⁹⁶ Gerd Theissen, *Social Setting*, 121-43; Witherington *Conflict and Community*, 186-202; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 607-61.

to the poor than previous studies have surmised.⁶⁹⁷ A *via media* between these two positions would be recognising the temptation to eat derived from the perceived potential for advancement in social status among the Weak as well as the cultural pressures inherent in resisting idolatry.⁶⁹⁸

Nevertheless, the issue for Paul in vv. 7-13 is clearly his disapproval over how the Strong are addressing the dispositions of the Weak. In vv. 7, 9-13, Paul pushes the practical logic of the Strong's arrogance separated as it is from love. Specifically, the Strong's practice of 'reclining' at a temple dining facility (ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον) is adversely influencing (the ironic use of οἰκοδομέω in 8:11) the Weak to reciprocate but at the expense of their moral conscience (8:10-11).⁶⁹⁹ The consequence of such behaviour is that rather than saving and preserving a brother, the Strong's knowledge has the potential of destroying a brother for whom Christ died (v. 11), thus incurring their own sin against Christ (v. 12). Knowledge and privilege divorced from love logically lend themselves to the destruction of the church for which Christ died (cf. 8:11; 10:1-13). Thus Paul concludes that if eating causes anyone to fall, may he never eat meat again (8:13).

These eating practices therefore entail two mutually exclusive dispositions or orientations of which eating practices are indicators: an arrogance that lacks the virtue of love in 8:1c and leads to destruction and judgment in 8:11-12, and a knowledge that entails love which is inclined toward 'building up' in 8:1c-3 and which leads to life and blessing as implied in the election language of 8:3 (cf. 9:12, 19-27; 10:13, 33).⁷⁰⁰ From this vantage point, the aphorism in 8:8, οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν, and its development in vv. 9ff make it clear that food, indeed whatever one does (10:31), is not the issue in and of itself, but rather serves as an index of orientations or dispositions that are either faithful or unfaithful to God's calling (8:3, 13).⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹⁷ Justin J. Meggitt, "Meat Consumption and Social Conflict in Corinth," *JTS* 45 (1994): 137-41.

⁶⁹⁸ Cheung, *Idol Food*, 146-7; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 216.

⁶⁹⁹ "The εἰδωλείῳ in which reclining occurs necessitates the presence of dining room facilities at a temple location" (Fotopoulos, *Food*, 221). Fee, *First Corinthians*, 386, observes that Paul's rhetorical question in 8:10 is "the only specific expression of the problem in chap. 8, and since this is still the major concern when 'idol food' is picked up again in 10:1-22, it seems certain that this is the real issue for which they are arguing against Paul's (apparently) former prohibition."

⁷⁰⁰ Cf. Gardner, *Gifts*, 32: "Paul regarded love for God as evidence that a person was known by God (8:3)."

⁷⁰¹ Cf. Phua, *Idolatry*, 127, who sees Paul's concern over idolatry as entailing 'unfaithfulness' to God.

8.5.3. Two Contrasting Cosmologies: Idols and Christ

The third frame of reference of the two complexes contrasted by Paul involves two mutually exclusive cosmologies. We noted above that subjective dispositions embedded in social practices are related homologously to larger socially manifested cosmologies. This observation leads naturally into Paul's third frame of reference for the Corinthians' γνῶσις. Paul links the practical and dispositional entailments of γνῶσις with a distinct theology and cosmology embedded within a series of aphorisms in vv. 4b-6:

οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς.
καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς,
ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί,
ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα
καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν,
καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα
καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

It is widely recognised that the content of the Corinthian Strong's knowledge in v. 4 is both theological and cosmological; that is, not only do the Corinthians affirm the basic Jewish monotheistic confession οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (v. 4c), but they understand that such a confession entails a particular orientation toward idols ἐν κόσμῳ, namely, their existence means nothing in a world created and sustained by the one God (οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, v. 4b).⁷⁰² Paul's reference to εἰδωλον ('phantom', 'image', 'form', or 'shadow')⁷⁰³ reflects a Hellenistic Jewish conception of what Greeks would term ἄγαλμα, ἀνδριὰς or εἰκόν.⁷⁰⁴ The place of idols in the world in v. 4b is developed by Paul with three clauses in vv. 5-6. The explanatory γὰρ in v. 5a⁷⁰⁵ is followed by a conditional

⁷⁰² Most scholars interpret Paul's use of the term κόσμος in 8:4 as denoting the physical world. See, e.g., Adams, *Constructing*, 141; Joel White, "Paul's Cosmology: The Witness of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians," in Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough (eds.), *Cosmology and New Testament Theology* (Library of New Testament Studies; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 91 n.8. The phrase οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ in v. 4b can be taken either as in an attributive ('no idol exists in the world') or a predicative ('an idol is nothing in the world') sense. The attributive sense arises from the parallel with v. 4c, οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ('no God except one') (cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 371 n.8; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 371). Others, such as Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:236 and White, "Paul's Cosmology," 91 n.8, argue that the predicative sense fits the context of the discussion far better, such that the phrase would read "an idol is of no consequence in the nature of things," which would be more in line with the Corinthian Strong's position.

⁷⁰³ BAGD 221.

⁷⁰⁴ Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 124; Phua, *Idolatry*, 130.

⁷⁰⁵ Fee, *First Epistle*, 371 n.10.

clause (the protasis): εἴπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς,⁷⁰⁶ which Paul appears to confirm in 5b with the phrase: ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, which is followed in v. 6 by what may be an apodosis to the conditional in 5a: ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

There are several factors involved in reconstructing the logic of these verses. First, the explanatory γάρ in v. 5a certainly favors v. 5 as a continuation of v. 4b. Secondly, v. 5b reflects a Jewish precedent that paradoxically trivialises idols as devoid of divine presence while also acknowledging the existence of other gods and lords in a hierarchically inferior position to the God of Israel (Exod 15:11; 20:2-6; 22:28; Deut 4:19; 29:26; 32:8-9; Ps 82:1; Mic 4:5; Jas 2:19), as well as ascribing to empty idols demonic influence for those in covenant with the God of Israel (cf. 1 Cor 10:19-21; Deut 32:21 with vv. 16;17; Isa 8:19 and 19:3 with chs. 40 and 44; Ps 106:36-39; *I Enoch* 19; *Jub.* 11:4-6).⁷⁰⁷ Thirdly, the comparative parallel between θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί in v. 5 and εἷς θεὸς and εἷς κύριος in v.6 suggests that the verses be taken together as mutually interpretive.⁷⁰⁸ Hence, 8:5-6 should be taken as a single commentary (which may involve Pauline qualification in 8:5) on the significance of the monotheistic statement of v. 4b. The determination as to whether such a commentary originates with Paul or the Corinthian Strong seems to have more to do with the interpreter's assessment of the degree to which Paul shares the views of the Strong, which is of course determined at a more macro-contextual level.⁷⁰⁹

Fourthly, contrary to (ἀλλά) the 'many gods and lords' in v. 5b, the monotheistic expression in 8:6, εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, reflects a

⁷⁰⁶ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 191, takes the protasis as a concessive (even if, for the sake of argument). So, too, Cheung, *Idol Food*, 123 n.124.

⁷⁰⁷ See Nanos, "Polytheist Identity," 183 n.10. See the extensive survey of Jewish attitudes toward idolatry and Gentile gods in the Septuagint and Second Temple Literature in Phua, *Idolatry*, 50-125. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 156-8, notes that there are two views of idolatry in Jewish tradition: the rational (there is no presence in the idol) and the non-rational (idolatry is infested with demonic activity). So, too, Horrell, "Theological Principle," 97 n.43.

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 371; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 123-4. The fact that the conditional statement of v. 5a is an *anacolouthon*, an incomplete conditional where the apodosis is omitted, is simply not determinative one way or the other as regards a Pauline interpolation. Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 371; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 631.

⁷⁰⁹ E.g., Fotopoulos, *Food*, 212, 214, sees v. 5b as a Pauline commentary which refutes the Strong's position and anticipates his equation of idols with demons in 10:19-22. "It is because these so-called gods and lords truly exist (as demons) that the Strong are not to eat idol-food" (Fotopoulos, *Food*, 212).

prepositional pattern indicative of Presocractic cosmology and developed in Stoic physics.⁷¹⁰ However, for all the parallels that may exist with Stoic or Platonic thought, this ἐκ/εἰς reciprocity is reformulated in v. 6 in terms of Paul's innovative Jewish monotheism, where the one God (εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ) is the source of all things (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα; cf. Rom 11:36) and the church (ἡμεῖς) is understood as those who are εἰς αὐτόν.⁷¹¹ The important point here is that the church for Paul comprises an integral component to the reciprocity inherent in this cosmology. Michael Lakey notes that while it is true that 'all things are allowed' for the Corinthians (6:12), it is also true that the ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν in 8:6a qualifies this freedom by observing that not 'all things' in the cosmos are equally 'in him'.⁷¹² The church thus comprises a "cosmic space," that is, "for Paul, the boundaries of the Christian community circumscribe that part of the κόσμος that is ordered correctly εἰς God."⁷¹³

Fifthly, there are scholars who argue that the phrase ascribed to the one Lord Jesus Christ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, in 8:6b reflects the mediatorial language of Jewish wisdom literature (Prov 3:19; Wisd. 7:26; Sir 24:9)⁷¹⁴ and the intermediate agency associated with a cosmogenesis common to middle Platonism and Stoicism (cf. Philo, *Cher.* 125-7; *Leg.* 3.7; *Leg.* 1.208).⁷¹⁵ In so doing, Paul ascribes a unique role in the creation of the world to the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus, "God the Father remains the effective cause of creation (ἐξ οὗ), but Christ has become the agent by means of which (δι' οὗ) God brings everything into existence."⁷¹⁶ However, Larry Hurtado's work on divine Christology has demonstrated that there is no precedent in Jewish literature for the kind of cultic devotion

⁷¹⁰ R. Kerst, "1 Kor 8:6 – Ein vorpaulinischches Taufbekenntnis?" *ZNW* 66 (1975): 130-9; Michael Lakey, *Image and Glory of God: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as a Case Study in Bible, Gender and Hermeneutics* (Library of New Testament Studies; London & New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 89-91.

⁷¹¹ Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:242; White, "Paul's Cosmology," 94, concludes that Paul implicitly affirms here as well as in Rom 4:17 what would be later termed *creatio ex nihilo*, which had Jewish precedent as per 2 Macc 7:28 and Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4.187. So, too, Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38A; Dallas: Word, 1998), 218.

⁷¹² *Image and Glory*, 91-92.

⁷¹³ Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 91.

⁷¹⁴ See, e.g., Horsley, "The Background of the Confessional Formula in 1 Kor 8:6," *ZNW* 69 (1978), 130-5; Dunn, *Theology*, 266-81.

⁷¹⁵ E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), 240ff; Gregory E. Sterling, "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts," *Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997): 219-38, 235ff; Horsley, "Background," 134; Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 90.

⁷¹⁶ White, "Paul's Cosmology," 94-5.

to Christ we see in Paul.⁷¹⁷ While these sources indicate that Second-Temple Judaism did have veneration of “divine agents,” none of the sources exemplify such figures being objects of formal cultic worship such as that seen in the Lord’s Supper. Hurtado concludes that there is no precedent for the cultic devotion given to Jesus among these groups, thus demonstrating a highly unique “mutation” of Jewish monotheism in early Christian circles.⁷¹⁸

Hurtado’s observation on the cultic uniqueness of Christianity, together with the nature of cosmic piety indicated by εἰδωλα in the world (8:4b), demonstrates the importance of interpreting and appropriating Paul’s Christology in relation to its ritual foundry. Having examined the contrasting eating practices, dispositions and cosmologies in 1 Cor 8:1-13, we are now in a position to determine the extent to which the Lord’s Supper texts evidence what Rappaport terms a ritually revealed Logos, a totalising order imposed upon the world through ritualised bodies. To get a fuller picture of what Paul considered essential to the ritual of commensality, I shall supplement Paul’s sole reference to the Lord’s Supper in 10:16-21 with his expanded discussion in 11:17-34. With 1 Cor 8:1-13 as our backdrop, the goal of such a determination is to uncover the ritualised source of the practices, dispositions and cosmology that Paul expects to characterise and identify the Corinthian believers as evidenced in 8:1-13 and, as we shall see, throughout the extended pericope of 1 Corinthians 8-10.

8.6. The New Covenant and the Ritual Meal

It is widely acknowledged among scholars that the ‘new covenant’ (καινὴ διαθήκη) associated with Christ’s cup in 1 Cor 11:25 is the covenant promised in Jer 31(LXX 38):31-34 (cf. 2 Cor 3:6a).⁷¹⁹ As part of the Lord’s Supper tradition that Paul ‘received

⁷¹⁷ *One God*, 97-9. So, too, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 636.

⁷¹⁸ Hurtado, *One God*, 17-92, provides a detailed analysis of the uniqueness of the cultic adoration of Christ in light of the precedence of the veneration of “principal agent” figures in Jewish texts. Hurtado codifies three types of treatment: (1) exalted patriarchs (e.g. Moses, Enoch, etc.); (2) personified divine attributes (e.g. Wisdom, Logos); and (3) principal angels (e.g. Michael, Yahoel, etc.). While these sources indicate that Second Temple Judaism did have veneration of “divine agents,” none of the sources exemplify such figures being objects of formal cultic worship. Hurtado concludes that there is no precedent for the cultic devotion given to Jesus among these groups, thus demonstrating a highly unique “mutation” of Jewish monotheism in early Christian circles.

⁷¹⁹ Hans-Joseph Klauck, *Herrenmahl und Hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1986), 312-3; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 268-9; Fee, *First Epistle*, 555; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 547; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 427, 433; Otfried

(παραλαμβάνειν) from the Lord' (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, 11:23)⁷²⁰ and handed down (παραδίδοναι) faithfully to the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:23a; cf. 11:2; 15:1, 3),⁷²¹ the new covenant is presented as Jesus' own interpretation of the significance of his death. The 'proclamation of the Lord's death' in 11:26 that establishes a new relationship between God and his people corresponds to the promise made in Jer 31:31-34, where the basis for God's new covenant with his people is the anticipated forgiveness of sins.⁷²² Thus, Paul's 'new covenant' reference in 11:25 makes explicit what he has alluded to earlier in the letter when he linked the Corinthians' ritual of commensality with the 'spiritual eating and drinking' of the people of God under the Sinai covenant that led to their judgment because of their sinful disobedience (cf. 10:3-4, 7, 16-17).⁷²³

The importance of Jer 31:31-34 for Paul's understanding of the significance of the Christ-event was corroborated in our earlier analysis of 1 Cor 12:13, where we concluded that for Paul baptism was in fact the fulfillment of the Ezek 36:25-27 promise of the Spirit (see 5.4-6). We noted that Paul's pneumatology, as evident in passages such as 2 Cor 3:3-6, involved a conceptual relationship between Ezek 36:25-27 and the new covenant promise of Jer 31:31-34.⁷²⁴ Hafemann notes: "Paul ... makes it explicit in [2

Hofius, "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25," in Ben F. Meyer (ed.), *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992), 75-115, 99; Panayotis Coutsoumpos, *Community, Conflict, and the Eucharist in Roman Corinth: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2006), 118; Hafemann, *Paul*, 119-28; etc. Fee, *First Epistle*, notes that there is a further allusion to Exod 24:8, such that "the wine of the cup signifies Jesus' blood poured out in death, which ratified the new covenant" (Cf. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 547; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 433).

⁷²⁰ On Paul's reception of the Lord's Supper tradition, see William R. Farmer, "Peter and Paul, and the Tradition concerning 'The Lord's Supper' in 1 Corinthians 11:23-26," in Meyer, *One Loaf*, 35-55.

⁷²¹ Klauck, "Presence," 60-62 explores rabbinic and Hellenistic uses of the terms παραδίδοναι and παραλαμβάνειν, though noting that the rabbinic sources involve uses that are dated considerably later than 1 Corinthians. Among Hellenistic texts, he cites Plato, who calls teaching and learning a process of παραδίδοντα and παραλαμβάνοντα (*Theat* 198B). Klauck further argues that the Lord's Supper tradition in 11:23-26 should be classified form-critically as a 'cultic aetiology', the purpose of which is "the grounding and explaining, in narrative form, of a cultic rite, simultaneously reflecting its concrete performance" (63). So, too, Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 75-77, who rehearses the various views on the pre-Pauline phase of the Lord's Supper tradition.

⁷²² Hafemann, *Paul*, 120. Cf. Hofius, "Lord's Supper," 99, who notes that "the word over the cup emphasizes that through this expiatory death the καινή διαθήκη (new covenant) has been realized: the eschatological act and order of salvation which – in fulfillment of the promise of Jer 31(LXX 38):31-34 – has as its object the forgiveness of sins and the communion with God thereby established."

⁷²³ Fee, *First Epistle*, 446; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 222. On the function of Paul's reference to τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον in 10:3 and τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα in 10:4 for his argument in 1 Cor 10:1-22, see below.

⁷²⁴ See, e.g., Paul's conceptual linking of his identity as a minister of a new covenant (καινή διαθήκη) with his reference to 'life-giving Spirit' (πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ) in 2 Cor 3:6.

Cor] 3:6a that he sees his *apostolic ministry of the Spirit* in fulfillment of Ezek 11:19 and 36:26f., with its focus on the work of the Spirit on the renewed heart, to be conceptually at one with his role as a *servant of the new covenant* in fulfillment of Jer 31:31-34.”⁷²⁵ Thus, as a minister of the Jeremiah-promised new covenant, Paul is mediator of the Ezekiel-promised Spirit and vice versa.⁷²⁶ And though the *conceptual* relationship between Ezekiel 36 and Jeremiah 31 has been recognised by scholars,⁷²⁷ such recognition has yet to acknowledge a comparable *ritual* relationship between the two texts in Paul. I shall examine the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 10:14-22 and 11:17-34 in light of three frames of reference analogous to those associated with the Ezek 36:25-27 tradition: time, socially-manifested cosmology and ethics. In doing so, I shall determine the extent to which these frames of reference extend out and inform our understanding of the larger context of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1. I shall argue that the temporal, cosmological and ethical frames of reference that constitute the Lord’s Supper incorporates the Corinthians into a cosmos reconciled to God through Christ’s own thanksgiving and self-giving. This incorporative reconciliation in turn provides the definitive paradigm for distinctly Christian eating practices and dispositions that are to inform the social and ethical lives of the Corinthians as evident in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1.

8.6.1. The Lord’s Supper and the Eschatological Presence of Christ

We noted that the Ezek 36:25-27 tradition in baptism entails an *eschatological* conception of time. The performance of the baptism ritual was an unambiguous attestation for Paul that the promised messianic age has now become a reality among the Corinthians in their present experience of the risen Christ through the Spirit. Turning to Paul’s understanding of the Lord’s Supper, we find a comparable conception of eschatological time associated with Jer 31:31-34. Centered as it is in 11:17-34, the Lord’s Supper paradox is couched in a larger context that is characterised by a certain eschatological thrust. In v. 19, Paul foreshadows the theme of God’s eschatological

⁷²⁵ Hafemann, *Paul*, 145.

⁷²⁶ Hafemann, *Paul*, 145.

⁷²⁷ E.g., Daniel I. Block’s observation that both Jer 31:33 and Ezek 36:27-28 involve the same event: “What Jeremiah attributes to the infusion of the divine Torah, Ezekiel ascribes to the infusion of the *rwḥ*. In both the result is the renewal of the covenant relationship” (“The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of *RHW* in the Book of Ezekiel,” *JETS* 32 [1989]: 27-49, 39).

judgment in surmising what appears to be his expectation of factions (αἰρέσεις) among the Corinthians.⁷²⁸ The term δόκιμος is generally translated ‘genuine’, ‘acceptable’, or ‘approved’, and entails the sense in v. 19 that the divisions among the Corinthians occur as an occasion for genuine Christians to stand out.⁷²⁹ Hence, the Corinthians risk divine retribution for ‘despising the church of God and shaming those who have nothing’ (11:22), such that ‘he who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment (κρίμα) to himself’ (11:29). The κρίμα-motif is developed in vv. 27-34 with Paul’s emphasis on eschatological judgment that has come forward into time and has caused illness and even death among some of the Corinthians (11:30). However Paul qualifies this judgment in v. 32 as God’s ‘discipline’ (παιδευόμεθα) so that they will not be condemned (κατακρίνω) with the world.⁷³⁰

As for the Lord’s Supper tradition itself, which Paul cites in v. 23 as the grounds (cf. γάρ) for his displeasure over the Corinthians’ factional behaviour,⁷³¹ there are several key temporal elements that appear integral to the ritual. First, the link between ὁσάκις and ἔαν in v. 26 signifies a recurring action (‘as many times as’), particularly against the backdrop of the twice-given anamnesis mandate, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in 11:24c, 25c.⁷³² Unlike baptism, which is consistently in the aorist, the celebration of the ritual meal appears as a recurring event in the lives of Paul and the Corinthians. Secondly, 11:26 draws together three directions of time: ὁσάκις γὰρ ἔαν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνετε [*in the present*] τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε [*in the past*] ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ [*in the future*].⁷³³ From the vantage point of ritual theory, Paul is blending temporal regions of past, present and future which has the effect of ritually generating a ‘time outside of time’ or what Turner calls ‘*communitas*’.⁷³⁴ It is here, in this

⁷²⁸ Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 195, observes, “this idea, foreshadowing the theme of God’s judgment that appears explicitly in verses 27-32, is rooted in Jewish apocalyptic soil.”

⁷²⁹ Barrett, *First Epistle*, 261-2; Fee, *First Epistle*, 538-9. Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 891 translates the term ‘those who are tried and true’. Gerd Theissen, “Social Integration and Sacramental Activity,” in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 164, refers to 11:19 as “part of the eschatological testing of the congregation.”

⁷³⁰ Fee, *First Epistle*, 566; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 276.

⁷³¹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 548; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 270; Fee, *First Epistle*, 556.

⁷³² Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 556; Hofius, “The Lord’s Supper,” 101. 1 Cor 10:25c specifies the recurrence of drinking: ὁσάκις ἔαν πίνετε.

⁷³³ Cf. Mark 14:25 and Jesus’ vow to drink anew on ‘that [future] day’ (ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ).

⁷³⁴ Rappaport, “Cognized,” 123. Cf. Turner, *Ritual*, 96.

blending of the temporal regions, that the ritual participants get a mythical sense of time, where distances between self and other, or the past and the future, often collapse.⁷³⁵

A key textual indicator of such temporal blending is Paul's identification of the ritualised bread and cup of the Corinthians as the same bread and cup of the original Lord's Supper (ὁσάκις ... ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον [!] καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνετε, v. 26a).⁷³⁶ The ritual logic of this identification entails that the ritualised gestures of eating and drinking shared among the Corinthians are in fact incorporated into Christ's ritualised gestures, namely, his thanksgiving (εὐχαρίστεῖν, v. 24a) and his identification of the broken bread and cup with his body and the new covenant in his blood respectively (vv. 24-25).⁷³⁷ The subject/ predicate relationship between the bread/ cup and Christ's body/ new covenant in his blood in the context of a performed ritual lends itself to the interpretation that the bread and cup are *indices* of Christ's body and blood.⁷³⁸ In semiotic theory, indexical signs have an existential relationship with their significata (such as smoke in relation to fire), in contrast to say symbolic signs, which share an arbitrary or conventional relationship with their significatum (how the phoneme 'tree' relates to its referent).⁷³⁹ Rappaport argues that the performative nature of ritual places a priority on the *indexical* which involves an inextricable subject/ predicate relationship between the sign and the significatum, such as the natural indices of a rash indicating measles or smoke indicating fire, or the conventional index of a grave marker indicating inhumation. Thus, a crowning ceremony performed upon a prince is not merely a symbol of his monarchical status but is rather an indicator or demonstration of it, in that to be crowned

⁷³⁵ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 224.

⁷³⁶ Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 100, who points out that P46 adds a τοῦτο after ποτήριον; cf. T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 and the Forms of Paul's Theological Argument," in D.M. Hay (ed.), *Pauline Theology, vol. 2: 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 116.

⁷³⁷ Similarly, Peter Lampe, "The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross," *Int* 48 (1994): 36-49, 46, observes that "time and space differences between Christ's crucifixion and the sacramental act become irrelevant, and the past event of the crucifixion is made synchronous with the sacrament. It is made 'present'."

⁷³⁸ Winter, *After Paul Left*, 153 observes that the neuter τοῦτο in 11:24a should be taken in distinction from the masculine ἄρτος, referring instead to Jesus' ritual actions. But he himself recognises that the neuter demonstrative can be used for emphasis (154). Furthermore, the demonstrative τοῦτο in v. 25 seems quite clearly to modify τὸ ποτήριον.

⁷³⁹ C.S. Peirce, *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*, Vol. 2 (1893-1913), ed. by The Peirce Edition Project, Nathan Houser, et al. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998), 5; cf. Rappaport, "Obvious Aspects," 180.

is to be king; monarchy is intrinsic to crowning.⁷⁴⁰ From this vantage point, Christ's own person is inseparable from the ritual elements, comparable to the way in which fire is inseparable from smoke. Thus, the eating and drinking of *this* bread and cup by its ritualised nature manifests the presence of Christ and the new covenant in the present in a manner comparable to his officiating over the original Lord's Supper in the past.⁷⁴¹

In context, the Jeremiah new covenant holds another key to this ritualised incorporation for, like the Ezekiel promise of the Spirit, at the heart of the new covenant is the divine promise that God will again dwell in the midst of his people (Jer 31:34), expressed in the covenant formula, ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν (Jer 31[38]:33; cf. 31:1; 32:38; Ezek 37:24b-28).⁷⁴² The Lord's Supper thus incorporates the Corinthians into Christ's own thanksgiving and thereby ritually manifests the presence of God in their midst. This is why Paul associates the proclamation of the Lord's death (τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, v. 26b) with their ritualised bodies: through their acts of eating and drinking, the Corinthians manifest in space and time the eschatological fulfillment of the Jeremiah-promised new covenant.⁷⁴³

The ritualised manifestation of Jer 31:31-34 thus accounts for the eschatological nature of this proclamation by virtue of the temporal reference ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ in v. 26c (cf. 4:5). While some have argued that the temporal reference reflects Paul's attempt to quell an 'over-realised eschatology' on the part of the Corinthians,⁷⁴⁴ the context suggests the opposite: Paul is seeking to correct the Corinthians' *under*-appreciation of the eschatological nature of their ritual of commensality.⁷⁴⁵ As I shall develop below, the Corinthians are in fact perverting the sacred space of the Lord's Supper with behaviour

⁷⁴⁰ Rappaport, *Ritual*, 57.

⁷⁴¹ It is widely recognised that Christ's identification between the inauguration of the new covenant and his blood-shedding death reflects the Hebrew precedent of forging covenants in blood (cf. Exod 24:8; Heb 9:20; 10:16-18). See Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 547; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 433; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 268-70. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 433, notes that the sharing of a common cup also had covenant implications (cf. Gen 14:18, 24; 26:26-33; 31:43-54; Exod 24:9-11; Josh 9:3-16).

⁷⁴² Hafemann, *Temple*, 40.

⁷⁴³ Contra Barrett, *First Epistle*, 270; Fee, *First Epistle*, 557; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 201, who interpret τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε as involving a *verbal* proclamation (e.g. a homily). But Paul is absolutely clear that it is indeed the somatic actions of eating and drinking '*this* bread and cup' that proclaims the Lord's death. See Beverly R. Gaventa, "'You Proclaim the Lord's Death': 1 Corinthians 11:26 and Paul's Understanding of Worship," *RevExp* 80 (1983): 377-87, 381-3; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 548-9.

⁷⁴⁴ Collins, *First Corinthians*, 434; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 251.

⁷⁴⁵ On the issue of the Corinthians supposed 'over-realised eschatology', see below.

indicative of the dominant Graeco-Roman social order which in effect nullifies the meal as ‘the Lord’s’ (11:20).⁷⁴⁶ As we saw above, the danger with such behaviour is that it risks incurring the judgment of God which is a consequence of experiencing his presence in their midst (11:27, 30) in anticipation of his cosmic judgment in the future (11:32). The temporal reference ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ seeks to impress upon the Corinthians that their ritual of commensality is in fact a foretaste of the time when God’s presence will pervade the cosmos (cf. 15:20-28).⁷⁴⁷ They are thus to live in the *present* in a manner comparable to how they shall live in the *future*, which is precisely what is embodied in a faithful enactment of the Lord’s Supper as per Paul’s addendum in v. 26.⁷⁴⁸

In 1 Corinthians 10, there is further indication that the Lord’s Supper incorporates the Corinthians into a unique experience of time. Paul anticipates his reference to the Lord’s Supper in vv. 16-21 by envisioning an analogous relationship between the Israelite wilderness generation of the past and the contemporary Corinthian congregation through the temporal phrase εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν in 10:11. Strecker has observed that Paul’s phrase εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν in 10:11 links the experience of the Israelite desert wanderings to the contemporary situation of the Corinthian church, not in the abstract, but tangibly through the rituals of baptism and the Lord’s Supper.⁷⁴⁹ Thus Paul is able to identify the food and drink of the Israelites under the Mosaic covenant with that of the Corinthians under the new covenant (10:3-4). It is thus through a ritualised reconstitution of time that Paul is able to draw an historical parallel between the Corinthians and the wilderness generation.⁷⁵⁰

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. James C. Walters, “Paul and the Politics of Meals in Roman Corinth,” in Friesen (ed.), *Corinth in Context*, 343-64, who sees Paul’s designation of the meal as hosted by Jesus as a rhetorical counter for competing authority posturing in the Corinthian community.

⁷⁴⁷ Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 888: “[T]he fellowship gathered around the table of the Lord (10:21) provisionally and in a partial measure constitutes the pledge and the first preliminary imperfect foretaste of the ‘Supper of the Lamb’ of the final consummation to which the Lord’s Supper points in promise.” So, too, Fee, *First Epistle*, 557, who sees Paul in v. 26 as “reminding the Corinthians of their essentially eschatological existence.”

⁷⁴⁸ I therefore take the phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖτε/ ὅσακις ἐὰν πίνετε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in vv. 24-25 as a remembrance of Christ’s inauguration of the new covenant and the salvific deliverance it effects. Fee, *First Epistle*, 553, writes: “It is not simply ‘in memory of him’, but it is eaten as a ‘memorial’ of the salvation that he has effected through his death and resurrection.” Contra Barrett, *First Epistle*, 267, who sees ἀνάμνησις as paralleling Hellenistic memorials for the dead; cf. Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 190.

⁷⁴⁹ Strecker, *Die liminale Theologie*, 228-9.

⁷⁵⁰ 1 Cor 10:1-13 has been the *locus classicus* for the Corinthians’ supposed ‘realised eschatology’. From this interpretive vantage point, the Corinthians have misinterpreted their baptisms as a ritual that provided some kind of immunity from falling away (cf. 10:2) and/or consequences of the sins listed in vv.

The important point made by Strecker regarding Paul's conception of ritual and time in 1 Cor 10:11 is that participation in the rituals of baptism and the Lord's Supper involves for Paul an experience of time analogous to that experienced by the wilderness generation, such that the Corinthians, like the former Israelites, are experiencing presently the τέλος, that is, the goal, intention, or completion, of world history in their concrete ritual encounters with God.⁷⁵¹ Thus Paul uses the Christological disclosure in the Lord's Supper as a ritualised analogy for God's sustaining his people in the wilderness. In addition to the reference to 'baptism into Moses' in v. 2,⁷⁵² he notes in vv. 3-4 that they all ate of the same spiritual food and drank the same spiritual drink, that is, both the Corinthians and the wilderness generation were fed and sustained by God, the term πνευματικός referring to water and food provided miraculously by the Spirit as they were divinely sustained in the desert.⁷⁵³ Further, this spiritual drink is identified as coming from 'that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ'.⁷⁵⁴ Thus, for Paul,

7-10. See, e.g., A. Schlatter, *Die Korintherbriefe: Ausgelegt für Bibelleser* (Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974), 120-1; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:365, 381; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 224; Hartman, *Into the Name*, 91-2; Fee, *First Epistle*, 443; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 220. However, scholars are arguing increasingly against this hyper-sacramental position. See, e.g., Karl Gustav Sandelin, "Does Paul Argue Against Sacramentalism and Over-Confidence in 1 Cor 10:1-14?," in Peder Borgen and Søren Giversen (eds.), *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1995), 165-82; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 181-2; Chester, *Conversion*, 337-42; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 228-9. First, the issue in 1 Corinthians 8-10 hardly suggests that the Corinthians believed they were guarded spiritually against any dangers inherent in Graeco-Roman meals. Instead, the context suggests that they saw no danger in such meals to begin with! If the Corinthians in fact adhere to the cosmology of 8:4b-6, then there simply were no gods who could pose potential threats to the Corinthians. Secondly, Paul is quite clear on the point of his midrash in v. 6: the recounting of a series of events leading up to God's judgment upon the wilderness generation served as examples (τύποι) so that the Corinthians might not 'lust after evil things as they lusted' (εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς καέτινοι ἐπεθύμησαν) and therefore suffer the same fate. On Paul's hermeneutic in 10:1-5, see Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 91-3; W.A. Meeks, "'And Rose up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10.1-22," *JSNT* 16 [1982]: 64-78; G.D. Collier, "'That We Might not Crave Evil': The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10:1-13," *JSNT* 55 (1994): 55-75.

⁷⁵¹ *Die liminale Theologie*, 247.

⁷⁵² Sandelin, "Sacramentalism," 170, cites a number of texts that indicate a Hellenistic-Jewish precedent for understanding the drops of rain from the cloud as identical with instruction in the Law (cf. Philo, *Opif.* 158; *Post.* 138; *Fug.* 166-67; *Somn.* 1.50; *Contempl.* 35; *Mut.* 258-60; *Spec.* 2.61-64), hence the possible conceptual source for the phrase 'baptism into Moses'.

⁷⁵³ Fee, *First Epistle*, 447; cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit*, 117. See Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 241ff., who maps out four possible interpretations for the references to 'spiritual food and drink' in 1 Cor 10:2-4. Wedderburn suggests that Paul may have picked up the term from the Corinthians (244). Paul's use of πνευματικός in 2:13, 15, 3:1; 9:11; 12:1, etc, demonstrates that the term is not specific to the rituals of the church.

⁷⁵⁴ Sandelin, "Sacramentalism," 168, identifies Num 20:7-11 and 21:16 as the backdrop for the rabbinic idea that the water-well followed the people in the desert (cf. *t. Sukka* 3.11; Pseudo-Philo, *Ant. Bibl.* 10.7; 11.15). Gardner, *Gifts*, 146-8, cites the reference to God as 'rock' in the so-called wilderness traditions (Deut 32:15-16; Pss 78:35; 95:1; etc).

the drink disclosed the presence of Christ in the midst of the wilderness generation under the old covenant (2 Cor 3:14) in an eschatological-telic manner analogous (τύπος, v. 6; τυπικῶς, v. 11) to the way in which Christ is disclosed through the cup of the new covenant in the midst of the Corinthian church in v. 16a.⁷⁵⁵ In the ritual supper, the temporal distinctions inherent in mundane time collapse and the Corinthians experience a temporal reality that for Paul conjoins them with the people of God in the desert, a ‘time outside of time’. By performing the ritual meal that drinks the ‘cup of the new covenant’ (11:25) which manifests in the present conditions comparable to God’s cosmic judgment in the future (cf. the κρίμα-motif throughout 11:27-34), the Corinthian *ekklesia* embody and become one with the arrival of the ‘end of the ages’ in time and space (10:11) and thus anticipate the consummation of the ages with the ‘revelation of Jesus Christ’ (1:7) and the transformation of the cosmos (6:13-14; 15:12-57).⁷⁵⁶

In sum, the Lord’s Supper fulfilled the prophetic promise of Jer 31:31-34 by incorporating the Corinthians into Christ’s own thanksgiving, which in turn manifested the presence of God in their midst. This divine incorporation into Christ’s thanksgiving revealed a unique experience of time, in that temporal demarcations of past, present and future (11:26) collapsed, manifesting a ‘time outside of time’, or what Paul called τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων in 10:11. Such a unique experience of time provided a ritualised rationale for the application of Israel’s past idolatrous desert experience (10:1-11) for the present Corinthian circumstance.

8.6.2. The Lord’s Supper and Cosmic Space

Secondly, like the Ezek 36:25-27 tradition, Paul’s ritualised understanding of the Jeremiah new covenant involves the formation of a distinct community. Intrinsic to the promise of Jeremiah is a new covenant with ὁ οἶκος Ισραηλ and ὁ οἶκος Ιουδα (31[38]:31), which will constitute them as a renewed people (λαός, v. 33) characterised

⁷⁵⁵ Cf. Sandelin, “Sacramentalism,” 181: “These events [in the wilderness] form prefigurations of the experiences in the present life of the Corinthian community, which Paul sees as an eschatological reality for which the Scriptures have been written (1 Cor 10:11). These realities are Christian baptism and the Lord’s supper on the beneficial side and pagan cultic practices on the sinister and seductive side. Although the events in the desert are seen as prefigurations of the Christian sacraments, Paul at the same time describes them in a different way from baptism into Christ and the Lord’s supper.”

⁷⁵⁶ Cf. Adams, *Constructing*, 107.

by the ubiquity of the knowledge of God (πάντες εἰδήσουσιν) and divine forgiveness of their sins (τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι, v.34).

But as we noted briefly above, Paul is furious with the Corinthians, rebuking them for their factional eating as in effect nullifying the celebration of the Lord's Supper (11:17-22). The social dimensions of 1 Cor 11:17-34 have been the object of considerable study over the past few decades. The groundbreaking work of Gerd Theissen has provided for many scholars the basic socio-economic frames of reference for surmising plausibly the controversy surrounding the Corinthian meal. Noting that the Corinthians were marked by internal stratification where only a few were 'wise', 'powerful', and 'of noble birth' (1 Cor 1:26), Theissen interpreted the eating of one's own meal as an indicator of wealth and status as over against those who were relatively impoverished, designated as οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες in 11:22.⁷⁵⁷ Theissen proposed that the wealthy, as providers of the meal, not only collectively ate by themselves but also consumed more and better foods and drink than what was offered to the poor.⁷⁵⁸ In so doing, the wealthy failed to distinguish between the food that belonged to the Lord, beginning with the consecration or breaking of the bread, and their ἴδιον δεῖπνον.⁷⁵⁹ Because the starting point of the ritual meal was not regulated, the various foods that had been brought were considered private property, that is, outside the purview of that required to be shared by the Lord's Supper tradition as stated in 11:23-25.⁷⁶⁰ In response, Paul is adamantly opposed to displays of wealth and patronage among the Corinthians in the context of the Lord's Supper, since such displays humiliate the poor by making it plain just how much they were dependent on the wealthier Christians (11:22).⁷⁶¹ Instead Paul proposes a compromise: all may eat whatever they want so long as they do so in their own homes. In the context of the church, meals are to be limited to the Lord's Supper of bread and wine.⁷⁶²

⁷⁵⁷ "Social Integration," 145-74, esp. 146-51. On the influence of Theissen for the so-called "New Consensus," see Barry D. Smith, "The Problem with the Observance of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian Church," *BBR* 20.4 (2010): 517-44, 518-9; David G. Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 249-50.

⁷⁵⁸ "Social Integration," 153-9.

⁷⁵⁹ "Social Integration," 153. This failure to distinguish between their own food and the Lord's food is how Theissen interprets the phrase μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα in 11:29 (153).

⁷⁶⁰ "Social Integration," 159.

⁷⁶¹ "Social Integration," 160.

⁷⁶² "Social Integration," 164.

While there have been a number of responses to Theissen's reconstruction, we find Theissen's original social reconstruction basically sound.⁷⁶³ The one exception is that there is no necessity in interpreting the phrase εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω in 11:34a as excluding completely satiation from the Lord's Supper. Lampe notes that the Greek term for 'dinner', δεῖπνον, never means just dry bread, but is inclusive of several types of food eaten with the bread.⁷⁶⁴ In like manner, Horrell observes: "The Lord's Supper must be a full meal, a celebration in which food and drink are shared out equally and in which the believers wait for one another."⁷⁶⁵ But it does appear to be the case that the Lord's Supper at Corinth involved two explicitly ritualised moments: the breaking of the bread which initiated a shared meal, followed by the blessing and corporate drinking of the cup which concluded the meal.⁷⁶⁶ The basic problem was that the wealthy, as sponsors of the meal, were eating and drinking on their own prior to the arrival of the poorer members, leaving only the bread and wine for consumption.⁷⁶⁷ Paul rejects this practice as nothing less than

⁷⁶³ Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 91-3, interprets the verb προλαμβάνει in 11:21 intensively (e.g. 'take' or 'consume') rather than temporally (e.g. 'eat beforehand'), and thus interprets ἕκαστος ... τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει in v. 21 as each person being limited to consuming only what they brought to the meal, resulting in the rich feasting and the poor eating what little they have. However, Paul's only other use of the verb ἐκδέχομαι in 11:33 is in 1 Cor 16:11 where it very clearly means 'to wait for'. This heavily favors a temporal reading of προλαμβάνει in 11:21. The adverbial phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν in v. 21 could easily designate the time in which the wealthy were eating their own meals, with the consecutive καί designating the consequences of such action: some were hungry while others were full. So, too, Smith, "The Lord's Supper," 538. A number of scholars have proposed that the Lord's Supper reflected the Graeco-Roman *eranos* meal, which involved each participant making a contribution to the meal that was then shared by all (cf. Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 3.14.1). See, e.g. Panayotis Coutsoumpos, *Paul and the Lord's Supper: A Socio-Historical Investigation* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2005), 46-51, 108-16; idem, *Community, Conflict*, 99-138; Klauck, *Herrenmahl*, 291-97, idem, "Presence in the Lord's Supper: 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 in the Context of Hellenistic Religious History," in Meyer, *One Loaf*, 57-73, 64-6; Lampe, "The Eucharist," 40; Smith, *Symposium*, 178, 342 n.8. The problem with interpreting the Lord's Supper as an *eranos* meal is that there is no evidence that the poor were expected to contribute to the meal. Instead, several scholars have advocated that the Lord's Supper at Corinth consisted of an ordinary meal followed by the ritualised sharing of the bread and cup. See, e.g., Günther Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," *ZThK* 53 (1956): 312-49; Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 178-85; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 3:12-28; Smith, "The Lord's Supper," 521-2, 530-43. In this scenario, the wealthy sponsor the ordinary meal but begin eating it before the poor arrive. Upon arrival, the poor find little or no food left, but they are not excluded from the breaking of the bread and blessing of the cup. However, this view posits that Paul wanted to eliminate or reduce significantly the preceding meal, leaving only the bread and cup. But there is no reason to interpret the Greek term for 'dinner', δεῖπνον, as limited to bread and wine.

⁷⁶⁴ "Eucharist," 42.

⁷⁶⁵ *Social Ethos*, 154. Indeed, prior to his argument for an elimination of the ordinary meal from the Lord's Supper, Smith suggests that only "when all the provisions are equally accessible will they be eating the Lord's Supper (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον; 11:20)" ("The Lord's Supper," 521-2).

⁷⁶⁶ So, too, Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 95; Theissen, "Social Integration," 152; Barrett, *I Corinthians*, 264; Lampe, "Eucharist," 37; Stowers, "Elusive Coherence," 69.

⁷⁶⁷ Chester, *Conversion*, 246-52, agrees with Theissen's reconstruction, but faults him for not taking adequate account of the sectarian nature of the σχίσματα and αἵρεσεις in vv. 18-19, which Chester sees as

the humiliation of those who have nothing and admonishes the Corinthian wealthy to wait for the gathering of the whole church before they partake of the meal.

In 1 Cor 10:16-22, we find Paul providing a distinctly *cosmological* rationale for the social order prescribed in 11:17-34. As for the social order itself, in 10:16-17, Paul interprets the Lord's Supper as identifying the ritual participants with the body of Christ (cf. 12:27). Paul uses the term κοινωνία twice in 10:16 (cf. 1:9) to describe the Corinthians' relationship relative to Christ's body and blood, the cognate κοινωνός twice in 10:18, 20, and the term μετέχω twice in 10:17, 21 (cf. 10:30). The term κοινωνία is often rendered as 'fellowship', 'participation', 'partnership' and/or 'communion'.⁷⁶⁸ Further, that Paul uses the verb μετέχω in v. 17 to interpret the social significance of the κοινωνία in v. 16 discourages us from making too fine a distinction between κοινωνία and μετέχω; they are rather mutually interpretive of one another, as demonstrated in Paul's use of μετέχειν for the act of eating in 1 Cor 9:12; 10:17, 21, 30.⁷⁶⁹ Moreover, both terms are used reciprocally to describe the cultic meals that Paul sets in opposition to the Lord's Supper in 10:20-21. By implication of their κοινωνία in v. 16 through the 'one bread' (εἷς ἄρτος, v. 17a), the Corinthians share a concomitant unity with one another (οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν, v. 17c) as ἐν σῶμα in v. 17b, which is mutually exclusive to the kind of social unity shared at Graeco-Roman cultic rituals in vv. 20-21, which Paul refers to as making them κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων. Thus Mitchell interprets this pericope as a common *topos* that appeals to cultic ties in an attempt to get divided groups back together.⁷⁷⁰

indicative of competition for honour among the wealthy. So, too, Walters, "Politics," 343-64. Rachel M. Mcrae has recently advocated that the divisions at Corinth were predicated more on the honour/ shame code of the Mediterranean world rather than on wealth, as evidenced by voluntary association meal practices. In light of those μὴ ἔχοντες and those ἔχοντες οἰκίας in v. 22, it is difficult to see how status and wealth categories can be sharply distinguished. See Rachel M. Mcrae, "Eating with Honor: The Corinthian Lord's Supper in Light of Voluntary Association Meal Practices," *JBL* 130 no. 1 (2011): 165-81.

⁷⁶⁸ Fee, *First Epistle*, 466; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 477; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 167-212. Campbell's study concludes that κοινωνία is more of an abstraction meaning "(the) having *something* in common with *someone*" (J.Y. Campbell, "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament," *JBL* 31 [1932]: 352-80, 356, emphasis original).

⁷⁶⁹ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 196-7; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 376-7.

⁷⁷⁰ *Rhetoric*, 254. These vertical and horizontal orientations in 10:16-17 have elicited two strands of interpretation: what Willis, *Idol Meat*, 167-8, terms the *participationist* view and the *associationist* view. The participationist view, inspired initially by interpretations of Graeco-Roman mystery religions, argues that, for Paul, when the ritualised meal of bread and wine was eaten and drunk, the body and blood of Jesus were in fact consumed. What made Christian ritual meals distinct was the patron-deity present at the meal. See, e.g., A. G. Eichhorn, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (E.T., Jeffrey F. Cayzer, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 82; Heitmüller, *Taufe*, 35-7, 51-3; Wilhem Bousett, *Kyrios Christos*

Yet here Paul draws into the ritualised context distinctly cosmological frames of reference. We observed above in our temporal analysis that the identification of the Corinthians' bread and cup with Christ's own ritual elements entailed that the Corinthians were in fact incorporated ritually into Christ's own thanksgiving (εὐχαρίστεῖν, v. 24a). The κοινωνία motif in 10:16-22 appears to involve comparable incorporative dynamics, but now with reference to cosmology. In 10:19, Paul recalls the issue of εἰδωλόθυτα and εἰδωλον in 8:1, 4-6, where Paul agreed with the Strong's understanding of idols ἐν κόσμῳ, namely, their existence means nothing in a world created and sustained by the one God (οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, v. 4b). But in 10:20, Paul takes the issue a step further: rather than focus on the εἰδωλον part of the compound word εἰδωλόθυτα as in 8:4b, he develops the significance of θύω, 'to sacrifice'. Thus, in a sense, Paul sets the issue of εἰδωλόθυτα aside in v. 19 in order to focus on something he finds far more pressing, namely the act of sacrifice itself.⁷⁷¹ For Paul, those who participate in Graeco-

(Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1913), 154-60; Ernst Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," in idem, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (ET by W.J. Montague; London: SCM Press, 1964), 108-35, 109-10; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 174. The associationist view involves understanding κοινωνία in terms of the relationship of participants with one another in the context of the ritual meal. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 187 interprets Paul's use of κοινωνία in 10:16 in light of its contextual development in vv. 19-21. The Israelites eat sacrifices and are thus κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, which would in effect, given the participationist view, have the Israelites participating in an impersonal altar. Rather, Willis argues that this κοινωνία involves more an associative significance, the worshippers eating together around an altar. Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 361-2 argues that κοινωνία in 10:16, 18 is a genitive of the thing shared in common, participation between believers in the one cup and one bread (v. 16) and partners of the altar (v. 18), and thus there is no evidence of a κοινωνία 'in' the god. Rather, we have κοινωνία *with* the god as partner at the meal. Cf. Harm W. Hollander, "The Idea of Fellowship in 1 Corinthians 10:14-22," *NTS* 55:4 (2009): 456-70; Campbell, "KOINΩNIA," 352-80. However, from a ritualised vantage point, it is very difficult to insist on a hard distinction between vertical participation and horizontal association, since both ritual media and ritual participants are invested with meaning homologous to a totalising ritualised cosmos.

⁷⁷¹ Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 368. It is this focus on the act of sacrifice that leads me to side with the majority opinion that Paul's use of the term θυσιαστήριον ('sacrifices upon an altar') in v. 18b denotes the priestly altar of Israel's Temple-cult. This is clearly the way Paul uses the term in his example of why he and his fellowship apostles could make their living on the gospel in 1 Cor 9:13-14 (see, e.g., Hugo Gressmann, "H KOINΩNIA TΩN ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ," *ZNW* 20 [1921]: 224-30; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 184-8; Fee, *First Epistle*, 470-1; Witherington, *Conflict*, 225; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 337-9). From this vantage point, the solidarity with God operative among the priests' participation in the altar is analogous to the dynamics operative in the Lord's Supper. Recently, some scholars have argued that Paul's example of Israel in v. 18 should be read in light of the more recent epistolary context of Israel's idolatry in 10:1-13 (Gardner, *Gifts*, 165-9; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 149-50; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 234-5.) However, Paul's use of the present participle οἱ ἐσθιόντες τὰς θυσίας ('those who eat the sacrifices') suggests a current ongoing action, in stark contrast to his consistent use of the aorist in 10:1-11. Further, this interpretation tends to blur the specificity of those who eat θυσίαι in 10:18, which involves those who actually offer sacrifices on the altar (i.e. priests; see Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 337-40). The pair of interrogative clauses in v. 19, ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν; ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόν τί ἐστιν, recalls the initial point of the pericope (8:4b-6) that Paul is now prepared to address in light of his extended argument. And the terminological similarities in vv. 20-22 with Deuteronomy 32 offer little support, since vv. 20-22 are no longer dealing with Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα but rather with Graeco-

Roman sacrifices participate in an event that occasions the manifestation of δαίμονια and thereby they do not sacrifice to God (they sacrifice δαίμονις καὶ οὐ θεῷ, 10:20a-b).⁷⁷² As such, Paul sees Graeco-Roman sacrifices as effectively orienting the world away from God and toward δαίμονια.⁷⁷³ This cosmic orientation would fit with a common piety in antiquity that considered temples as models of the cosmos. According to Dio Cassius, the magnificent cupola of the Pantheon was modeled after the heavens (Dio Cass. 53.27.2). Isidore of Seville similarly observed: “the ancients would make the roofs of their temples in the shape of a tortoise shell. These would be made thus to duplicate the image of the sky, which is evidently convex” (*Etymologies* 15.8.8).⁷⁷⁴ The third-century Neoplatonist Porphyry describes the mithraeum as ‘a model of the universe,’ a miniature replica of the cosmos (*Antr. nymph.* 6).⁷⁷⁵ Thus for Paul participation in Graeco-Roman sacrifice, which entails being κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαίμονιων in v. 20c, involves nothing less than a perversion of the cosmos.

However, this perversion involves an important counterpart: if being κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαίμονιων entails a social order that orients the cosmos away from God, then it is the ritualised κοινωνία τοῦ Χριστοῦ that *reorients the world back to God*. It is in light of this cosmic reorientation that Paul’s instructions in 10:25-26 take on considerable significance. In v. 25, the Corinthians are instructed by Paul to eat anything sold in the market μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.⁷⁷⁶ The term in vv. 25 and 27, ἀνακρίνω (cf. 1 Cor 2:14-15; 4:3-4; 9:3; 14:24), was a forensic term used in Greek jurisprudence denoting the pre-trial ‘investigation’.⁷⁷⁷ His re-use of συνείδησις hearkens back to his

Roman temple cults which Paul would be interpreting in light of his Jewish frames of reference.

⁷⁷² On the nature of δαίμονια in Graeco-Roman and Jewish contexts, see Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 349-57, positing that the “wide range of meanings” associated with the term may have contributed to “a gulf of understanding ... between Paul and the Corinthians” on the significance of δαίμονια (357).

⁷⁷³ Barclay, “Food,” 588: “... what concerns Paul is what we might call the *orientation* of the food and of its consumption. If food is regarded, and eaten, in orientation to *daimonia*, it cannot be oriented to God, and thus what comes from God and belongs to him (‘the earth is the Lord’s and everything in it’) is blasphemously redirected away from God to something or someone other.”

⁷⁷⁴ *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (ET by Stephen A. Barney, et al; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 312.

⁷⁷⁵ Roger Beck, *The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 41.

⁷⁷⁶ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 136-46, discusses the area in Corinth referred to by Pausanias as the Peribolos containing the statue of Apollo, which may be the *macellum* Paul has in mind. See, too, C.K. Williams II, “Roman Corinth as a Commercial Center,” in T.E. Gregory (ed.), *The Corinthia in the Roman Period* (JRASup, 8; Ann Arbor, MI: JRA, 1994), 31-46; Horrell, “Idol-Food,” 124.

⁷⁷⁷ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 231; Friedrich Büchsel, “ἀνακρίνω,” *TDNT* 3.943.

discussion of the dispositional contrast between arrogance and love in 1 Cor 8:1-13 (cf. vv. 7, 10, 12). Paul is thus in effect saying that the Corinthians can eat any foods sold in the market (and served at a home) “without asking about it to reach a judgment.”⁷⁷⁸ In grounding this instruction, Paul references Ps 24(LXX 23):1: τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.⁷⁷⁹ Rabbinic tradition interpreted Ps 24:1 as justification for a mandatory table-thanksgiving that blesses God for the food: “One must not taste anything until he has [first] recited a benediction [over it], as Scripture states, *The earth is the Lord’s and all that it contains* (Ps. 24:1)” (*t. Ber.* 4:1).⁷⁸⁰ The Lord’s Supper tradition itself involves comparable language (cf. τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν in 10:16a), which is the main reason why scholars have posited a pre-Pauline eucharistic tradition in 10:16.⁷⁸¹ The τὸ ποτήριον motif was relatively common in Judaism and could be associated with mutually exclusive metaphors, such as a symbol of salvation (Pss 16:5; 23:5; 116:13) and judgment (e.g. ‘the cup of wrath’, cf. Jer 25:15, 17, 27; 49:12; 51:7; Hab 2:16; Ezek 23:31-34; Isa 51:17-23; etc).⁷⁸² A phrase similar to τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας is used in *Jos. Asen.* where Joseph speaks of drinking a ‘blessed cup of immortality’ (πίνει ποτήριον εὐλογημένον ἀθανασίας, 8:5) and prays “let her eat your bread of life, and drink your cup of blessing’ (φαγέτω ἄρτον ζωῆς σου καὶ πιέτω ποτήριον εὐλογίας σου, 8:11).⁷⁸³ A similar blessing is found in the Rabbinic tradition, such as *b. Ber.* 35a: “It is forbidden to man to enjoy anything belonging to this world without a blessing; he who enjoys anything of this world without a blessing commits a violation,”⁷⁸⁴ and *y. Ber.* 7.3: “R. Jacob bar Aha took the cup and recited [the invitation to recite the blessings of the

⁷⁷⁸ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 779. In light of Jewish concerns over food taboos, Barrett concluded from this passage that “Paul is nowhere more un-Jewish than in his μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες. His whole life as a Pharisee had been essential one of ἀνάκρισις, not least into foods” (“Things Sacrificed,” 146; idem, *1 Corinthians*, 240, where Barrett writes: “Paul had in fact ceased to be a practising Jew.” This statement by Barrett has come under intense scrutiny, particularly by Cheung, *Idol Food*, 20-2, 154, 299 and Fotopoulos, *Food*, 7-8. However, Cheung, *Idol Food*, 154, and Fotopoulos “Rhetorical Situation,” 167-9, root Paul in Jewish sensibilities that are contradicted by both his cosmology and his ritual.

⁷⁷⁹ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 235, observes: “he [Paul] sees the permission as based upon the doctrine of Creation, not simply a concession to some in Corinth.”

⁷⁸⁰ Jacob Neusner, *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew Vol. I* (New York: Ktav, 1986), 19. Cf. 1 Cor 10:30 with *m. Ber.* 7:1: “If three have eaten together, they are obliged to summon (each other to say grace after meal together).” See Eduard Lohse, “Zu 1 Cor 10.26, 31,” *ZNW* 47 (1956): 277-80; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 240; Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction*, 199; Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 205, 254.

⁷⁸¹ Cf. Käsemann, “Pauline Doctrine,” 108-35; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 476; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 193.

⁷⁸² Goppelt, “Ποτήριον,” *TDNT* 6:153-8.

⁷⁸³ C. Burchard (ed.), *Joseph and Aseneth* (PVTG 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁷⁸⁴ Fee, *First Epistle*, 467 n.26, notes that such blessings were mandatory in the rabbinic tradition.

meal].”⁷⁸⁵ However, as Lohse originally noted, the Rabbinic tradition does not apply Ps 24:1 to the *macellum* in a manner comparable to Paul, who sees Ps 24:1 as justification for eating all (πᾶς) that is sold at the meat-market, not giving offense to either Jew or Gentile (10:32).⁷⁸⁶ It is therefore quite possible that Paul is reading the cosmology of Ps 24:1 not merely in light of the Christ-event, but in light of a specific act of Christ, namely, his own table blessing at the Lord’s Supper (11:23). As such, Paul would be interpreting Christ’s thanksgiving as having the effect of returning the creation back to God.⁷⁸⁷

The logical relationship between food and creation appears rooted in vv. 30-31: whether Strong or Weak, members of the *ekklesia*, by receiving all things in thanksgiving (εὐχαριστέω),⁷⁸⁸ glorify God and are *therefore* part of the new creation reconstituted toward the Father through the Lord Jesus Christ as embodied paradigmatically in the sharing of the ritual meal (1 Cor 8:6; 9:19-23; 10:16-17, 28; 11:23-25; cf. Rom 14:6, 14, 20).⁷⁸⁹ I therefore agree with the dissenting line of scholarship that argues that idol-food

⁷⁸⁵ *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation, Vol I* (ET by Tzvee Zahavy; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 267; cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 379 n.16.

⁷⁸⁶ Fee, *First Epistle*, 482, observes: “Apart from his radical statements on circumcision, it is hard to imagine anything more un-Jewish in the apostle than this.”

⁷⁸⁷ Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*, 206, rejects the idea that Paul here nullifies halakic food restrictions, noting that the context involves Paul addressing a church of Gentiles over the issue of idolatry and that “it is by no means necessary to assume that Paul when quoting Ps 24:1 had the food laws in mind, let alone that he declared them void.” However, Tomson not only fails to make a distinction between εἰδωλόθυτα (idol food) and εἰδωλόλατρία (idolatry), but also fails to account for Paul’s explicit statement in 9:20, μὴ ὦν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον, which he actually eliminates from the text despite the overwhelming textual evidence (277-9). See the critique by Kim, “*Imitatio Christi*,” 211-14.

⁷⁸⁸ I therefore see the actions of εὐλογέω (10:16a) and εὐχαριστέω (10:30; 11:23) as basically synonymous. So, too, Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 437.

⁷⁸⁹ Cf. Scott J. Hafemann, “Eschatology and Ethics: The Future of Israel and the Nations in Romans 15:1-13,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 51.2 (2000): 161-92, 168-69. Barrett has noted that the verses constituted by 10:29b-30 are “notoriously difficult” (Barrett, *First Epistle*, 242). Fotopoulos, *Food*, 246, concludes that vv. 29b-30 are anticipated objections raised by the Strong. (246) The problem with this interpretation, as Fotopoulos notes, is Paul’s use of γάρ in v. 29b after the maxim that the Corinthians are to do all things seeking the good of others, which appears to be a connective rather than an adversative (cf. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:471). Furthermore, scholars remain unconvinced that Paul offers any direct response to these supposed objections (Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 243; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 247; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 161; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 789; contra Fotopoulos, *Food*, 246-7). Others see the verses as representing Paul’s response to the Weak who are judging the Strong’s freedom (cf. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor., VIII, 1-13; X,23-XI,1),” *RB* 85 [1978]: 543-74, 570). Fee, *First Epistle*, 486 n.52, objects that this interpretation would involve a shift in audience (from Strong to Weak) not indicated by the text. There are others who see vv. 29b-30 as the rationale for Paul’s restrictions in vv. 28-29a (Cheung, *Idol Food*, 161; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 243; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 246-50; Fee, *First Epistle*, 485-7). Paul is saying that there is no reason, given the Weak’s conscience, that what is received in thanksgiving should be unnecessarily blasphemed, and, as such, Paul is actually looking out for the Strong here. Hence the conclusion of v. 31, do all things in thanksgiving and self-giving. Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 377, argues that

or food in general was hardly adiaphoric for Paul (in that eating in thanksgiving is an indicator of the dawning of the messianic age) but without their insistence that Paul's Judaistic background rendered all idol-food unclean. For Paul, Christ returns the world back to the Father, thus restoring the cosmology of Ps 24:1 (1 Cor 10:26, 28) as celebrated in thanksgiving to God for all foods and drink (10:30-31).

In the context of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, the Lord's Supper would be a ritualised disclosure of the cosmology of 1 Cor 8:6, where all things are *from* God and *through* Christ. We noted Lakey's observation above that while all things are from God the Father and through Christ, the ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν in 8:6a and ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ in 8:6b demonstrate that among 'all things' in the cosmos only the Corinthians are equally 'in him' or 'through him'.⁷⁹⁰ The church thus comprises a "cosmic space," such that the church constitutes that part of the κόσμος that is ordered correctly εἰς God. Thus, for Paul, the Lord's Supper and Graeco-Roman altars entail two incompatible ritually revealed cosmologies: the former restores the cosmos while the latter perverts it. Fellowship around the Graeco-Roman altar is a ritualised occasion for the manifestation of demons and thus the perversion of God's cosmos redeemed in Christ (cf. 10:26). As ritual participants in Christ's restorative thanksgiving, the Corinthians are transformed into one body, sharing in one cosmic order from God and through Christ.

Finally, in terms of the ritual relationship between Ezek 36:25-27 and Jer 31:31-34, we must note how the σῶμα-motif in 10:17 links together baptism with the Lord's Supper. In 1 Cor 12:12-13, Paul writes that the Corinthians were all baptised into ἓν σῶμα constituted by the Spirit, such that through the ritual washing their physical bodies were transformed into 'members' (μέλη; 1 Cor 12:12; 12:14, 18, 19, 20) of the intra-subjective 'body of Christ' (12:27). In 10:17, this same social body (ἓν σῶμα) appears again through a ritualised act, this time involving the one loaf (εἷς ἄρτος) which is identified with Christ in v. 16b. Through eating a ritualised element identified with the physical body of Christ, the Corinthians are transformed into a social body (cf. 11:29)

v. 29b should be linked directly v. 27, where Paul permits the acceptance of invitations to dine with unbelievers and eat whatever is put forth, with vv. 28-29a acting as a parenthesis that qualifies the general rule on behalf of the Weaker brother. Thus, the Strong's freedom is upheld but qualified in relation to voluntary self-giving on behalf of others. All but the first option preserve the basic interpretation offered here: all foods are made clean in thanksgiving directed toward God.

⁷⁹⁰ See above.

which, according to 12:13, is the very pneumatic body into which each person was baptised. The important point here is that this pneumatically-constituted social body in which they were all baptised appears every time the Lord's Supper is celebrated. The σῶμα-motif thus links together socially the baptism ritual with the Lord's Supper, providing a ritual relationship (the mutual formation of a social body) analogous to the conceptual reciprocity between Ezek 36:25-27 and Jer 31:31-34: the two rituals function together to *introduce* and *reproduce* respectively the pneumatic body.

In sum, while the *temporal* dimensions of the Lord's Supper collapsed time in such a way as to incorporate the Corinthians into Christ's original thanksgiving, the *corporate* dimensions of the Lord's Supper revealed the cosmic effects of that thanksgiving: the restorative reorientation of the cosmos back to God. For Paul, the 'cup of the Lord' and the 'cup of demons' represent nothing less than two incompatible ritually-revealed cosmologies.

8.6.3. The Lord's Supper and the Ethics of Self-Giving

Finally, like his understanding of the Ezek 36:25-27 tradition, Paul interprets the new covenant of Jer 31:31-34 as involving a divinely renewed ethical life. Indeed, central to the new covenant is God's promise, διδοὺς δώσω νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτούς (31[38]:33), which is the divine solution to the perennial problem of Israel's disobedience (Jer 7:21-26; 9:12-16; 11:14; 14:11; 15:1).⁷⁹¹ Hence Paul can see himself as a minister of the καινὴ διαθήκη in 2 Cor 3:6 who mediates the Spirit οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις in 2 Cor 3:3.

At the heart of this renewed ethical life is Christ's own *self-giving* revealed in the Lord's Supper. For as the paradosis makes clear, the new covenant is forged in Christ's own blood (11:25), which, in the context of his thanksgiving, is the very ethical dynamic by which the cosmos was redeemed to God. However, in the context of 1 Cor 11:17-34 and 10:1-22, this covenant relationship with God through Christ involves the very real potential of God's judgment upon those with whom God is not pleased (10:5-10; 11:27-32). As noted above, Paul anticipates the theme of God's eschatological judgment in 11:19, which suggests that the divisions among the Corinthians occur as an occasion for

⁷⁹¹ For an exposition on the inextricable link between the new covenant and Israel's sin in Jeremiah, see Hafemann, *Paul*, 129-30.

genuine Christians (δόκιμοι) to stand out. Horrell notes: “Paul is concerned here precisely with those who are truly ‘brothers and sisters’: if anyone calls themselves an ἀδελφός but is guilty of certain sins, then the Corinthian Christians are not even to eat (note the choice of this specific term) with such a person (5.11). Certainly not all who regarded themselves as one of the company were accepted by Paul as ‘genuine’ or ‘approved’.”⁷⁹²

Thus Paul’s rebuke (ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, v. 22) of the actions among the Corinthian wealthy could hardly be stronger: in shaming those who have nothing they ‘despise the church of God’ (τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε, 11:22) and risk being ‘guilty of/liable for the body and the blood of the Lord’ (ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, 11:27).⁷⁹³ By rehearsing the Lord’s Supper tradition, Paul is able to denounce the factional eating among the Corinthians as eating the bread and drinking the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner (ἀναξίως), such that their eating practices pervert the proclamation of the Lord’s death and the dawning of the new covenant.⁷⁹⁴ Conversely, Paul’s warning implies that a worthy celebration of the Christian ritual of commensality would in fact ritually fulfill the ethical transformation that Jeremiah foresees, precisely because such a celebration manifests the presence of God in the midst of his people (cf. Jer 31:1, 33-34; 32:38; Ezek 37:24b-28). Hence, as a corrective to the divisive behaviour at the table, Paul declares that one cannot partake of the Lord’s Supper in a worthy manner without examining oneself (δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτόν) in v. 28. Against the backdrop of 11:19, Paul’s admonition δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτόν in v. 28 involves a self-conscious reflection on the part of each person as to whether one is living in the present in a manner analogous to how one shall live in the parousia.⁷⁹⁵ The fact that Paul considers that it is in this manner (καὶ οὕτως) that one is to eat of the bread and drink of the cup leads to the conclusion that such an eschatological life is precisely what is enacted and shared in the

⁷⁹² Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 151.

⁷⁹³ Scholars generally take ἔνοχος as a forensic term in relation to the judgment of God (cf. Garland, *I Corinthians*, 550; Fee, *First Epistle*, 210).

⁷⁹⁴ Hays, *I Corinthians*, 200, observes: “to eat the meal unworthily means to eat it in a way that provokes divisions, with contemptuous disregard for the needs of others in the community.”

⁷⁹⁵ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 891, recognises Paul’s imperative that ‘a person should examine his or her own genuineness’ (δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτόν) in v. 28 in relation to v. 19, where the divisions reveal οἱ δόκιμοι, ‘those who are tried and true’. So, too, Barrett, *First Epistle*, 273, who sees the ‘testing’ motif in v. 28 as looking back to the ‘genuine’ motif of v. 19. Cf. Fee, *First Epistle*, 562, who connects Paul’s call δοκιμαζέτω ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν in the *present* with God’s *future* “divine examination” (cf. 11:29). Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 152, comments: “Such people, [the wealthy] Paul insists, must test themselves and consider what they are doing, before they eat and drink (v. 28).”

Lord's Supper.⁷⁹⁶ For in sharing together a satisfying meal in the presence of God, the Corinthians together overcome the poverty by which those 'who are without' are characterised (cf. 1:26ff.) and thus anticipate in the present the fullness of God's provisions characteristic of future new creation life.⁷⁹⁷

The problem is that in humiliating 'those who have nothing', the wealthy in effect pervert the self-giving dispositions and practices indicative of this eschatological life by observing those customs specific to Graeco-Roman meal etiquette, such that Paul can say that they fail to observe the Lord's Supper (11:20). The amount of food given to each person was a highly charged index of status in rituals of commensality. Pliny observes how the act of distributing different food quantities and qualities to each person served to classify the host's acquaintances (*Ep.* 2:6). Smith documents that the amounts of food distributed were often determined by social rank within the shared community, demonstrated by one's proximity to the symposiarch.⁷⁹⁸ As with their practice of baptism (1:10-17), such actions in effect compromise the apocalyptic significance of the ritual meal and thus reconstitute their social relations in line with pre-messianic conditions.

The Corinthians thus risk suffering divine judgment on account of their *μὴ διακρίνοντες τὸ σῶμα* (11:29). There are two major interpretive options surrounding the phrase *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα* in v. 29: *τὸ σῶμα* in v. 29 is taken either as a description of the Christian community⁷⁹⁹ or as a shorthand, a *pars pro toto*, for the *τὸ σῶμα* and *τὸ*

⁷⁹⁶ Contra Klauck, *Herrenmahl*, 324, who interprets the adverb *ἀναξίως* in v. 27 as connoting ritual purity more than a moral state: "Das Wort unwürdig, das in die Sphäre kultischer Reinheitsvorschriften verweist, ist adverbial gebraucht, d. h., es bezeichnet nicht den sittlichen Zustand des Empfängers, sondern die Art und Weise seines Handelns." Thus, the central issue regarding *ἀναξίως* is inappropriate behaviour at the table. However, by invoking the Lord's Supper tradition, Paul interprets their behavior in light of the Jer 31:31-34 new covenant, which promises to deal decisively with the perennial problem of *sin* by writing God's law on human hearts (7:25f., 9:12-16; 11:14; 14:11; 15:1; 2 Cor 3:3-6).

⁷⁹⁷ Cf. Lampe, "Eucharist," 45, who observes that Christ's death is not proclaimed solely in the sacred words or the break of the bread, but "also proclaimed and made present by means of our giving ourselves up to others. Our love for others represents Christ's death to other human beings. Only by actively loving and caring for others does the participation in the Eucharist 'proclaim' Christ's death as something that happened for others."

⁷⁹⁸ Smith, *Symposium*, 33-34. For an overview of Graeco-Roman dining practices and their social indicators, see Inge Nielsen and Hanne Sigismund Nielsen (eds.), *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998); Katherine M.D. Dunbabin and William J. Slater, "Roman Dining," in Michael Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 438-66.

⁷⁹⁹ See, e.g., Fee, *First Epistle*, 564; Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 200-1; Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 153; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 439.

αἷμα of the Lord associated with the bread and cup.⁸⁰⁰ The former tends to see Paul's use of τὸ σῶμα in v. 29 in light of his previous and similar use of the term in 10:16-17, while the latter allows the more immediate 11:27 to govern the sense of the term. Horrell notes that in light of the fact that v. 29a-b twice uses both the verbs ἐσθίω and πίνω and that vv. 27-29 have referred three times to both bread/body and cup/blood, it is suggestive that Paul does not write τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα in v. 29c.⁸⁰¹ This appears corroborated by our observation above that it is precisely within the context of the cosmic space of the church that believers can learn to live their lives in the present in a manner comparable to life in the age to come. Indeed, the whole thrust of vv. 27-34 is eschatological, drawing the Corinthians' attention to that day when they will stand before God (cf. 11:29, 32), which has already come forward into time in a proleptic manner in their present circumstances. Thus it would appear that Paul's concern over μὴ διακρίνοντες τὸ σῶμα is that the Corinthians risk divine judgment if they fail to discern the significance of the presence of God in their midst, which is after all the prerequisite for their eating and drinking *judgment* (κρίμα) upon themselves in v. 29. The Corinthians are thus experiencing a divine presence that requires of them a transformed ethical life that is itself evidence of the work of God in their lives (11:28, 31; cf. 6:11, 19; 2 Cor 3:18). I therefore interpret μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα as a failure to discern the community as constituted by the presence of God (cf. 12:12-13) through the ritualised gestures of eating and drinking.⁸⁰²

Thus, by rehearsing the Lord's Supper tradition which he received from the Lord, Paul is not merely reminding the Corinthians of Christ's sacrifice on their behalf so that they might behave toward one another in like manner. Rather, Paul is reminding them that a worthy observance of their ritualised incorporation into the self-giving of Christ constitutes social conditions that in fact fulfill their ethical obligations as the new covenant people of God. Hence to shame a brother is to despise the church of God in the midst of which God dwells (v. 22) and to be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (v.

⁸⁰⁰ See, e.g., Barrett, *First Epistle*, 275; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 3.51-2; Hofius, "The Lord's Supper," 114; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 893-4.

⁸⁰¹ Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 153; Fee, *First Epistle*, 563-4.

⁸⁰² Chester, *Conversion*, 250, links διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα with οἱ δόκιμοι in v. 19 against the contextual backdrop of competition for honour between the richer members, and thus concludes that those who eat διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα "step back from such competition and look beyond their status concerns to recognise the needs of the whole church." I agree only noting that such 'worthiness' is for Paul evidence of the presence of God working in their lives.

27), as both the church and the Lord coalesce into a ritualised mechanism by which a renewed ethical life can be fulfilled. Indeed, to the extent that this transformational dynamic is perverted the church is in danger of being destroyed (11:30, 32, 34; cf. 3:16).

In 1 Corinthians 10, the ethical concern primarily involves ειδωλολατρία and paying homage to δαιμόνια. The term ειδωλολατρία (idol-worship) in v. 14 is drawn from ειδωλόλατρης (idol-worshipper) in v. 7, which functions as part of Paul's conclusion to his midrash in vv. 1-5.⁸⁰³ In v. 6, Paul concludes that the sins and destruction of the wilderness generation occurred as τύποι, that is, as historical examples detailing behaviour from which the Corinthians are to refrain (ἐπιθυμητής κακῶν).⁸⁰⁴ The terms ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμέω originally denoted an orientation or impulse towards food, sexual satisfaction etc, or, more broadly, desire.⁸⁰⁵ However, the terms were eventually picked up by the philosophical schools to designate the sensual passions from which philosophers were liberated.⁸⁰⁶ The phrase ἐπιθυμία κακή was used by Plato to connote reprehensible desire (*Leg.* IX, 854a; *Resp.* I, 328d; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.64: πονηρὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἔχων ... τῆς ἀρετῆς προτρέπων ἐπιθυμεῖν).⁸⁰⁷ In the Hellenistic Jewish tradition, Philo refers to ἐπιθυμία as the ἀπάντων πηγὴ τῶν κακῶν or "fountain of all evils" (*Leg.* 4.84).⁸⁰⁸ The Palestinian Targum of Ex 20:17 and Deut 5:21 sees 'covetousness' as the source of all sins, going so far as to identify pagans with 'those who covet'.⁸⁰⁹

What is interesting here, given our ritual theory on the relationship between ritually-disclosed cosmic order and subjective disposition, is that Paul identifies ἐπιθυμέω in 10:6 as that disposition which is homologously related to idolatry and its constituents illustrated in 10:7-10.⁸¹⁰ Specifically, ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν is the disposition behind the

⁸⁰³ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 230.

⁸⁰⁴ Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 731-2.

⁸⁰⁵ F. Büchsel, "θύμος, ἐπιθυμία, κτλ.," *TDNT* 3:167-71, 168.

⁸⁰⁶ Cf. Plato, *Phaed.* 83b; Plutarch, *Virt. Mor.* 10; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.16.45; 2.18.8. Cf. Büchsel, "θύμος, ἐπιθυμία, κτλ.," *TDNT* 3:168-9.

⁸⁰⁷ Büchsel, "θύμος, ἐπιθυμία, κτλ.," *TDNT* 3:168. Cf. Plato's *Gorgias* 507e, where he notes that the man who lives by ἐπιθυμία is pleasing neither to man nor to God.

⁸⁰⁸ Collier, "Evil," 69.

⁸⁰⁹ Stanislas Lyunnet, et al, *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1998), 54.

⁸¹⁰ Here I follow Collier, "Evil," 57 n.11, who argues that the introduction formula ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν designates v. 6 as a heading under which vv. 7-10 are supporting points, and that each of sins listed in vv. 7-10 are followed by explanatory statements while the ἐπιθυμία-clause in v. 6 is not. Contra Meeks, "And Rose up to Play," 69-71, who sees the ἐπιθυμία-clause in v. 6 as subordinate to παίζειν in v. 7. Others who see ἐπιθυμία as a genus accompanied by four species (idolatry, sexual immorality, testing the Lord grumbling) are Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 224; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 167;

nexus of practices such as idolatry (εἰδωλολάτρης, v. 7), sexual immorality (πορνεύω, v. 8), testing Christ (ἐκπειράζω, v. 9; cf. 8:12) and grumbling (γογγύζω, v. 10). Paul here reflects a pattern in his letters and the wider Jewish milieu that identifies ἐπιθυμία as the root of sin and idolatry. For example, in Rom 7:7, Paul attributes the proscription against ἐπιθυμία in the Law as that which gave birth to ‘all lust’ (πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία) in Rom 7:8. Similarly, in Rom 1:23-24 Paul equates humanity’s ἐπιθυμίας with their exchanging the glory of God for an εἰκὼν of created things. This pattern corresponds to Collier’s argument that Numbers 11 is behind the midrash in 10:1-13, the main theme of which “is a denunciation of ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν (those who crave evil things).”⁸¹¹ Indeed, as Collier concludes, along with Philo, ἐπιθυμέω in 10:6 “is not merely one of the listed sins, but *the source* of sin to be explicated.”⁸¹²

However, the revelation of the new covenant in the lives of the Corinthians entails that God remains faithful to his people by providing for them his transformative presence that sanctifies and enables them to endure and persevere in faith (10:13; 6:11, 20).⁸¹³ Thus, in the context of his imperative to the Corinthians φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας in v. 14, Paul turns to the transformative power of the presence of God inherent in the Lord’s Supper ritual in vv. 16-21. As we saw above, the Lord’s Supper incorporates the Corinthians into the transformative thanksgiving and self-giving of Christ and thus manifests the presence of God in their midst, constituting them as ‘one body’ (v. 17). In contrast, Graeco-Roman sacrifices constitute a social order that manifests the presence of

Willis, *Idol Meat*, 143.

⁸¹¹ Collier, “Evil,” 63ff. In 1 Cor 10:6, Paul’s use of ἐπιθυμητήν represents its only NT occurrence, which Büchsel, “θύμος, ἐπιθυμία, κτλ,” *TDNT*, 3:172, sees as an “obvious allusion” to Num 10:34: ἐκεῖ ἔθαιψαν τὸν λαὸν τὸν ἐπιθυμητήν. Cheung, *Idol Food*, 144, see Ps 105 LXX setting the pattern for Paul, where the Israelites had ‘lustful cravings’ (ἐπεθύμησαν ἐπιθυμίαν, v. 14) and ‘tempted God’ (ἐπείρασαν τὸν θεόν, v. 14; cf. 1 Cor 10:9), they ‘grumbled’ (γογγύζω, v. 25; cf. 1 Cor 10:10) and ‘worshipped idols’ (προσεκύνησαν τῷ γλυπτῷ, v. 19, 28, 36-39), sacrificing their ‘sons and daughters to demons’ (ἔθυσαν τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν τοῖς δαιμονίοις, v.37; cf. 1 Cor 10:20-21) and ate profane or ‘lifeless’ sacrifices (ἔφαγον θυσίας νεκρῶν, v. 28).

⁸¹² “Evil,” 71.

⁸¹³ This is why Paul can draw his subordinate conclusion (ὥστε) in vv. 12-13 by resolving the warning ‘if you think you are standing, watch out that you do not fall’ in the covenant faithfulness of God (v. 13), in that God will rescue the Corinthians not from idol-foods but from their *temptations* (πειράζω, πειρασμός). So, too, Collier, “Evil,” 62; Gardner, *Gifts*, 153-4.

demons (10:20).⁸¹⁴ The presence of divine beings at cultic meals is very clearly described in Aelius Aristides of Smyrna's account of the Sarapis cult:

And mankind exceptionally makes this god alone a full partner (κοινωνοῦσιν) in their sacrifices, summoning him to the feast and making him both their chief guest and host, so that while different gods contribute to different banquets, he is the universal contributor to all banquets and has the rank of mess president (συμποσιάρχου) for those who assemble at the times for his sake ... he is a participant in the libations and is the one who receives the libations, and he goes as a guest to the revel and issues the invitations to the revelers, who under his guidance perform a dance. (*Or.* 45.27-28)⁸¹⁵

As 'one body' constituted by God's presence through Christ, for the Corinthians to participate in sacrificial rituals is to 'provoke the Lord to jealousy' (παραζηλῶ, 10:22) in a manner analogous to God's displeasure with the wilderness generation (10:5; cf. Deut 32:21),⁸¹⁶ for such a participation is nothing less than a contradiction of the ποτήριον of the Lord and the new covenant that has been inaugurated through his sacrificial death (10:21; 11:25). For like the Spirit-promise of Ezekiel that has transformed the Corinthians into the 'temple of God' (3:16; 6:19), the Jeremiah new covenant promises deliverance from the idolatrous disobedience that characterised the people of God in the wilderness as well as the Israel and Judah of Jeremiah's day (Jer 31:32; cf. 11:1-10; 22:9-10).⁸¹⁷ Thus, to participate in idolatry is nothing less than to deny their own disclosure of the presence of God embodied in the renewal of their social and ethical lives and thereby to provoke the Lord to jealousy (10:22).⁸¹⁸

As we draw this investigation of the ethics of self-giving revealed in the Lord's Supper (along with the Corinthians' misappropriations) to a close, we may now

⁸¹⁴ Lampe, "Eucharist," 42-3 observes that Paul's parallel between the Lord's Supper and Graeco-Roman cultic meals, such as the Sarapis cult, in 1 Cor 10:18-22 suggests the presence of the Lord at the eucharist table.

⁸¹⁵ *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, trans. By Charles A. Behr (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981). Cf. a number of examples of similar invitations involving κοινωνία τῶν ἱερῶν in Klauck, *Herrenmahl*, 156.

⁸¹⁶ Fee, *First Epistle*, 473.

⁸¹⁷ Hafemann, *Promise*, 198; idem, *Paul*, 129-35.

⁸¹⁸ Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 369, similarly concludes: "Paul's great fear was that Christians would be seen involving themselves with other Christians in cultic activity, and would thereby lose all their significance and distinctiveness as the church of God in the eyes of unbelievers. ... Paul's strong aversion to Christians being seen eating and drinking at a pagan meal thus reaches its climax in 10.20-22, when a believer himself might offer the sacrifice and would thus be seen to be 'leading' other believers to join him in eating and drinking. All Christian distinctiveness would thereby be totally lost and Christian community and pagan community would become one."

summarise briefly the three frames of reference that identify the Lord's Supper as a liturgical Logos:

- (i) The Lord's Supper revealed a unique sense of time by incorporating the Corinthians into Christ's original thanksgiving and thus manifested the presence of God in their midst.
- (ii) Christ's original thanksgiving redeemed the world back to God, thus revealing the Corinthian church as a cosmic space in which all things are 'from God and through Christ'.
- (iii) The ethical mechanism by which Christ redeemed the cosmos was through his self-giving, having forged the new covenant in his own blood. It is by participating in Christ's thanksgiving and self-giving that the ethical obligations of the Corinthians, initially embodied at baptism, are ritually fulfilled.

Therefore, while certainly clouded by controversies specific to the Corinthian context, the frames of reference that constitute the Lord's Supper as a liturgical Logos can in fact be clearly delineated: by celebrating the ritual of commensality, the Corinthians embodied temporal, cosmological and ethical realities that incorporated them into Christ's own thanksgiving and self-giving, which in turn ritually imposed upon their shared lifeworld a Christocentric order where all things are 'from God and through Christ' (8:6). Precisely because of this ritualised cosmology, where all things are returned back to God through Christ, Paul can forbid absolutely inequities at the Lord's Supper indicative of Graeco-Roman norms (11:17-34), as well as any participation on the part of the Corinthians in idolatrous practices that orient the world away from God and toward demons (10:1-22).

In light of our ritual theory, the question before us now is whether such a liturgical Logos informed Paul's concerns in 1 Cor 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 in a manner comparable to Bourdieu's theory of habitus. As explained above (8.4), the habitus is an embodied reproduction of socially-manifested cosmologies in subjective dispositions and practices. We are therefore interested in investigating the extent to which the Lord's Supper, as a liturgical Logos, provides the socially-defining frames of reference paradigmatic for Paul's instructions and admonitions regarding food sacrificed to idols.

8.7. Fostering a Christian Habitus: 1 Cor 10:23-11:1

In 10:23-11:1, Paul writes of another ethical dimension inherent in the Lord's Supper. Because the Lord's Supper is that paradigmatic meal, in Douglas' sense of the term, that defines the social and ethical frames of reference necessary for a life defined in relation to Christ, the Corinthians are therefore obligated to live out a habitus in their syntagmatic meals that is concomitant with the revelation of the new covenant in their paradigmatic meal. Having been delivered from idolatry (1 Cor 6:9; 12:2), the Corinthians are thereby able to glorify God as creator and redeemer (10:26, 30-31) in lives that are lived-out embodiments of Christ's own thanksgiving and self-giving into which they are incorporated in their ritual meal (cf. 10:16-17; 11:1). It is precisely this kind of Christological embodiment which Paul expounds in 1 Cor 10:23-11:1.⁸¹⁹

In v. 23, Paul twice uses what appears to be the Strong's slogan, πάντα ἔξεστιν (cf. 6:12), the two terms echoing the Strong's position in 8:1, 4b, 9-10, but now against the backdrop of Christ's self-giving revealed through the Lord's Supper. Thus Paul can qualify πάντα ἔξεστιν with two mutually interpreting terms, συμφέρειν and οἰκοδομεῖ, the implications of which are then summarised in v. 24: μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου. For Paul, this is to be the governing disposition among the Corinthians as it reflects the disposition governing the Christocentric cosmos. Rather than insist on their prerogatives (πάντα ἔξεστιν), the Strong are to 'imitate Christ' (11:1) by considering the needs of others as more important than their own, thereby building up and prospering the Corinthians' community in Christ.⁸²⁰ Against the backdrop of Paul's previous reference to οἰκοδομεῖ which he attributes to ἀγάπη in 8:1, we can see in retrospect that μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου is the general principle elucidated throughout 8:1-13 as it is rooted in Christ's paradigmatic self-giving in the Lord's Supper of 10:16-17.⁸²¹

⁸¹⁹ On the Christological dimension of Pauline ethics in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, see Horrell, "Idol-Food," 128-40. For an overview of the various proposals on how 10:23-11:1 fits into Paul's overall argument in 1 Corinthians 8-10, see Joop Smit, "The Function of First Corinthians 10:23-30: A Rhetorical Anticipation," *Bib* 78 (1997): 377-88.

⁸²⁰ Cf. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 226-8; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 176. Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 256, observes that Paul's appeal to common advantage is an example of common and significant *topoi* about factionalism and concord.

⁸²¹ Similarly, Willis, *Idol Meat*, 228, who abstracts the principle from the life of Christ, Phil 2:4, 5, 20; Rom 15:2,3).

Paul then applies this principle of self-giving to two further eating contexts in 10:25-30: food purchased at the *macellum* and table etiquette at an unbeliever's home.⁸²² As we noted above, the Corinthians are instructed by Paul in vv. 25-26 to eat anything sold in the market μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντας διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν because Christ has redeemed the earth back to God. As participants in this redemption through the Lord's Supper, whatever the Corinthians receive in thanksgiving is an extension of Christ's paradigmatic thanksgiving which has restored creation to its Creator, and by receiving all things in thanksgiving the Corinthians give glory to God (10:30-31). However, as 10:28-29 makes clear, because the disclosure of this Christological cosmology is inseparable from Christ's self-giving of his blood and body manifested in the cup and bread in 10:16-17, Paul is insistent that there can be no true thanksgiving without *self*-giving. The general principle for invitations⁸²³ to eat at an unbeliever's table is the same as purchasing food at the *macellum*: they are permitted to eat whatever is placed before them μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντας διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν, since all things are made clean in thanksgiving (10:30). Yet Paul qualifies this principle with the accompanying principle of 10:24: μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου, the principle of ἀγάπη (ἀγάπη ... οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ, 13:5). Thus, if someone (τις) informs them that the food served is idol food, they are to abstain δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν (v. 28). Paul explains v. 28 by v. 29a: συνείδησιν δὲ λέγω οὐχὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἑτέρου. There have been various proposals for the identity of the unspecified informant,⁸²⁴ but, as we have seen, Paul links

⁸²² Fotopoulos, *Food*, 235-6. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 244, summarises Paul's discussion thus far as involving two classes of eating in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: "eating at the τράπεζα δαιμονίων and thus becoming κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων (10:20-21) which is forbidden outright. Second, other eating which while permissible must always be qualified by consideration of the other person – as indeed everything a Christian does is so qualified (10:31-32)."

⁸²³ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 236, notes that the term καλεῖν, 'to invite', is a common idiom in papyri dinner invitations, citing P. Oxy. 747; 926; 927; 1214; 1486; 1487; 2147.

⁸²⁴ As for the identity of the 'someone' (τις, v. 24), there are scholars who argue that the use of the term ἱερόθυτον for sacrificed food rather than εἰδωλόθυτον identifies the informant as a pagan, most likely the host of the meal. (Cheung, *Idol Food*, 158; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 227; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 484, who sees the informant as a pagan guest; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 177; Smit, "The Function," 383). Some have argued that the context focusing on the relationship between Weak and Strong Christ-believers renders more plausible one of the Weak as the informant (Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 242; Witherington, "Not So Idle Thoughts," 247, this being Witherington's earlier view which differs from his two latter studies cited above; Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom or the Ghetto," 570; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 377). Still others find the hypothetical nature of the reference too ambiguous for any degree of certainty or precision. (Willis, *Idol Meat*, 242-3; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 160; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 2:469-70; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 787-8).

συνείδησις with a subjective orientation that can be defiled (8:7), wounded (8:12), and hence, destroyed (8:11).⁸²⁵ Thus, with 1 Corinthians 8 as our backdrop, it appears that Paul is concerned that the Strong's ἐξουσία can become a stumbling block (πρόσκομμα) to the weaker brother by causing him to eat that *for which he cannot give thanks* and for which he thereby fails to glorify God (8:9-11, 13; 10:28-29, 30-31).

Thus, Paul's argument throughout this extended pericope involves both a negative and positive apologetic as found in 1 Cor 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1. Negatively, as the Strong appear to believe that through thanksgiving all foods are made clean (which they would have surmised from their ritualised participation in Christ's own thanksgiving), their eating practices are potentially causing weaker brothers to eat that for which they cannot give thanks (8:7, 10). The Strong, in causing the weaker brother to perish by their eating prerogatives, would as a consequence incur God's judgment, having sinned against Christ (8:12), *which in effect nullifies their thanksgiving*. Hence, Paul's concern with the Strong is that their practical dispositions reproduce a cosmos devoid of thanksgiving to God, *which is precisely the very idolatrous cosmos they claim to deny in 8:4b!* The habitus of the Strong in fact betrays the Christocentric cosmos upon which such a habitus is justified (8:6).

In contrast to the ἐπιθυμία-orientation constitutive of idolatry and the 'table of demons' (10:14-22), the 'love that edifies' in 8:1 is most explicitly demonstrated in the Lord's Supper which reveals Christ's own self-giving of his blood and body in the cup and bread respectively (10:16-17). It is this ritualised self-giving that Paul will refer to in the context of Christ's own 'giving thanks' (εὐχαριστέω) in 11:24. Thus, for Paul, the Lord's Supper reveals that there is no true *thanksgiving* without *self-giving* in a Christologically-defined habitus, since nothing short of self-giving love embodies the fact that God has reconciled the cosmos to himself in Christ (cf. 11:1; 2 Cor 5:18). Love is the disposition of God embodied in Christ and therefore must be the disposition of those who are now participating in that cosmic reconciliation. Hence, 8:7-13 pushes the practical logic of the Strong's knowledge separated from self-emptying love: rather than saving and preserving a brother, the Strong's practical knowledge has the potential for destroying a brother for whom Christ died (v. 11), thus incurring their own sin against

⁸²⁵ Fotopoulos, *Food*, 245.

Christ (v. 12). Knowledge and privilege divorced from self-emptying love logically lend themselves to the destruction of the church for which Christ died (cf. 8:11; 10:1-13). Thus Paul concludes that if eating causes anyone to fall, may he never eat meat again (8:13).

Therefore, by interpreting the Lord's Supper as a liturgical Logos, we conclude that the three contrasts in 1 Cor 8:1-13 converge in the contrast between the *τράπεζα κυρίου* and the *τράπεζα δαιμονίων* in 10:16-22, which is for Paul a *cosmological* contrast governed by two incompatible dispositions, *ἀγάπη* and *ἐπιθυμία*. The Lord's Supper reveals the disposition of God through Christ's self-giving of his blood and body in the cup and bread respectively, while the *τράπεζα δαιμονίων* reveals a world governed by *ἐπιθυμία κακῶν*. Paul's concern is that he sees a breakdown among the Strong between their *habitus* and their ritually revealed cosmology: in arrogantly causing others to stumble, their practical dispositions in effect reproduce a cosmology devoid of self-giving and thanksgiving to God, which is the very cosmology that they formally *deny* in 8:4b. The Strong's eating practices thus betray the Christocentric cosmology upon which such actions are purportedly based (8:4c-6). In calling the Strong to embody a *habitus* marked by thanksgiving and self-giving, Paul calls them back to a shared lifeworld that manifests a cosmic space where all things have been returned back to God through Christ, such that in eating and drinking, indeed in whatever they do, they glorify God (10:31).

8.8. Summary and Conclusions

We began our analysis of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 by observing that the fundamental interpretive issue surrounding this pericope is that of coherence: what is the principle behind Paul's seemingly permissive instructions regarding the eating of idol-food in 8:1-13 and 10:23-11:1 and his absolute proscription against idolatry and the table of Graeco-Roman gods (*τράπεζα δαιμονίων*) in 10:1-22? After surveying the two main proposals for the intelligibility of Paul's argument, what I termed the majority and dissenting positions, it was argued that the majority position was correct in its assertion that Paul agreed with the basic premise of the Strong (they do have a right or privilege [*ἐξουσία*] to eat food sacrificed to idols), while we demurred from seeing idol-food as an *adiaphoron*. Instead, in the course of Paul's argument, we concluded that food was in fact an index of

orientations or dispositions that are either faithful or unfaithful to God's calling (8:3, 13, 10:31).

We then noted that one area that has been overlooked by scholars in determining the principle common not only to Paul's permission and proscription but also the practical, dispositional and cosmological indicators in 8:1-11:1 is the role of the Lord's Supper in 10:16-21. Rappaport argues that rituals are often totalising in their effect: the performance of rituals imposes an order upon the world such that cosmic orders are made in correspondence to the complex representations of liturgical orders in their entirety. Rituals in effect bind together into a single coherent whole the natural with the cultural, the individual with the group, the discursive and the non-discursive. We further noted that this sense of social 'normalcy' has been developed by the work of Bourdieu, who argues that the human body situated within a social order both reflects and reproduces dynamically that order through a mechanism he terms 'habitus'. The two key insights here were, first, that the norms, habits, rules, understandings and goals that constitute a social order are not learned abstractly or intellectually but rather through the unconscious inculcation inherent in bodily postures, gesticulations and rules of etiquette. And, secondly, the social inscription entailed in various reciprocal practices produces dispositions that are homologous to the socially manifested cosmologies through which they are acquired.

Turning to the text, we began by noting that Paul contrasted two incompatible eating practices: an eating practice among the Strong that defiles the consciences of the Weak vs. Paul's practice of refraining from any behaviour that would be a stumbling block to the gospel. Using Douglas' paradigm, we found that because meals are syntagmatically related to a defining paradigmatic meal, the Weak would have easily associated eating food in the temple environment with the cultic act of sacrifice itself. Further, Paul's voluntary laying-down of his own apostolic prerogatives anticipated his discussion of Christ's own example of self-giving in the Lord's Supper. We then examined Paul's second contrast, which was a contrast between two incompatible dispositions which are entailed in the habitus of the two eating practices. The Strong exemplify an arrogance which Paul sees as devoid of the virtue of love (8:1-13), which is harming the consciences of the Weak, bringing judgment upon the Strong and thus destroying the

church. Paul is thus anticipating his contrast between the idolatrous tendencies of ἐπιθυμία in 10:6 and the self-giving of Christ in the Lord's Supper in 10:16. We then turned to the third contrast (to which the dispositions are homologously related), a contrast between two different cosmologies: a world constituted by idols and a world where all things are *from* God and *through* Christ (8:4b-6).

We then, inspired by Rappaport's ritual theory, found that the church manifests this Christological cosmology by virtue of a liturgical Logos, namely, the κοινωνία constituted by the shared ritual meal. We reconstructed Paul's interpretation of the Lord's Supper from 11:17-34 and 10:16-21. In doing so, we found it widely acknowledged among scholars that the 'new covenant' (καινή διαθήκη) associated with Christ's cup in 1 Cor 11:25 is the covenant promised in Jer 31(LXX 38):31-34 (cf. 2 Cor 3:6a). As corroborated by our baptism study, we determined that Jer 31:31-34 along with its counterpart Ezek 36:25-27 was central to Paul's understanding of the significance of the Christ-event and his apostolic ministry as mediator of the Spirit. We further noted that the scholarly recognition of the conceptual relationship between Jer 31:31-34 and Ezek 36:25-27 had yet to translate into the recognition of a ritual relationship between the two prophetic promises. We therefore examined Paul's understanding of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian context in light of three frames of reference analogous to the ritualised manifestation of Ezek 36:25-27: a distinct conception of time, socially-revealed cosmology and ethics. In the process, we determined the extent to which these frames of reference constituting a ritualised Logos extended out and informed our understanding of the larger context of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1.

First, we found that the Lord's Supper entailed a distinct conception of time that incorporated the Corinthians into Christ's original thanksgiving and self-giving and thereby manifested the presence of God in their midst in fulfillment of Jer 31:33-34 (1 Cor 11:23-26). The presence of God mediated by Christ in effect collapsed the temporal demarcations of past, present and future (11:26) and thus manifested a 'time outside of time' or what Paul called τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων in 10:11, which provided the rationale for the application of Israel's past idolatrous desert experience (10:1-11) for the present Corinthian circumstance.

Secondly, we determined that Paul's concern over the social dynamics behind the Lord's Supper in 11:17-22 stemmed from his conviction that the Corinthian community constituted the fulfillment of the Jeremiah promise that God would redeem for himself a people in the midst of whom he might dwell (31:1, 33-34; 32:38; Ezek 37:24b-28). The ritual meal thus constituted for Paul a *κοινωνία* that manifested a cosmic space wherein the created order was reconciled back to God through Christ's thanksgiving and self-giving (10:20-21, 25-26, 30-31). As such, their ritual of commensality was a ritualised disclosure of the cosmology of 1 Cor 8:6, where all things are *from* God and *through* Christ. Because Gentiles sacrifice to demons and not to God (10:20), the Corinthians cannot participate in temple sacrifices without participating in that act which perverts the cosmos, orienting it away from God and toward demons and thus reconstituting pre-messianic conditions. Finally, we observed that the *σῶμα*-motif in 10:17 links together socially the Lord's Supper with the baptism ritual in 12:12-13: the pneumatically constituted *σῶμα* into which the Corinthians were all baptised (12:13) is manifested recurrently in their practice of the ritual of commensality (10:17). The two rituals thus function together to *introduce* and *reproduce* respectively the pneumatic body.

Thirdly, we found that Paul believed the divine presence manifested in the Corinthians' observance of the Lord's Supper to be the primary agency whereby their ethical lives might be recurrently transformed. Paul was thus convinced that the Lord's Supper was the ritualised fulfillment of the ethical transformation foreseen by Jeremiah where God would 'write his law on the hearts of his people' and deal decisively with the perennial problem of disobedience (Jer 31:33; cf. 7:21-26; 9:12-16; 11:14; 14:11; 15:1). At the heart of this ethical transformation was Christ's *self-giving* in forging the new covenant in his own blood. However, by failing to live in the present in a manner indicative of how they shall live in the future kingdom, the Corinthians risk the judgment of God which has already fallen on some (11:30) and will continue (11:27) until the Corinthians disregard their status-enhancing meal practices and manifest social conditions constitutive of their eschatological life in Christ (11:19, 28, 33-34). Thus their ritual of commensality should lead the Corinthians away from the disposition of *ἐπιθυμία* (10:6) constituted by social practices such as *εἰδωλολατρία* (10:14) through relying on the transformative presence of God which overcomes all temptation (10:13). Because the

presence of God is disclosed through the transformation of their social and ethical lives, participation in idolatry which manifests the presence of demons in effect perverts their own disclosure of divine presence and thereby provokes the Lord to jealousy in a manner comparable to the people of God under the old covenant (10:22; Deut 32:21).

We then noted that because practices and dispositions as part of a bodily habitus are related homologously to socially manifested cosmic orders, the Strong cannot divorce their Christocentric cosmic space from the homologous disposition of love (8:1-3), since both redeemed cosmology and sacrificial disposition are united in Christ as his blood and body are disclosed in the Lord's Supper. For Paul, this means that, whether Strong or Weak, members of the *ekklesia*, by receiving all things in thanksgiving in light of Christ's paradigmatic thanksgiving (εὐχαριστέω) in 11:24, glorify God and are *therefore* part of the new creation, thus embodying the restored cosmology of Ps 24:1 (1 Cor 10:26, 28). And yet, the Lord's Supper reveals that there is no true *thanksgiving* without *self-giving* in a Christologically-defined habitus, since nothing short of self-giving love embodies the fact that God has reconciled the world to himself in Christ (cf. 11:1; 2 Cor 5:18). Love is the disposition of God embodied in Christ and therefore must be the disposition of those who are now participating in that cosmic reconciliation by virtue of their bodily habitus manifested in the somatic κοινωνία of the Lord's Supper (10:17).

However, the irony is that the practices of the Strong in fact betray the very ritually revealed Christocentric cosmology by which they justify such practices (cf. 8:6). For Paul, the Strong's insistence on their ἐξουσία at the expense of the Weak's συνείδησις would in fact reflect and reproduce a social order more constitutive of idolatry, since such an insistence has the potential to cause a weaker brother to eat that for which he cannot give thanks, thus leading to his destruction (8:9-11, 13; 10:28-29). Such a consequence would subject the Strong to God's judgment and thus in effect negate the Strong's thanksgiving (8:12). Both desiring one's ἐξουσία at the expense of the Weak on the one hand and desiring food for which one cannot give thanks on the other embodies a cosmos devoid of self-giving and thanksgiving which is the very cosmology the Strong claim to reject (8:4b), and *therefore* their eating practices are in fact condemned.

A ritual reading of Paul thus provides a single principle that is common to Paul's permissive instructions and his absolute proscriptions: both Paul's permissiveness (all

things to all people as an expression of self-emptying love) on the one hand and his absolute prohibition (from idolatry which is an expression of a cosmos devoid of self-giving and thanksgiving to God) on the other are necessary entailments of a Christocentric cosmology disclosed in ritual.

Paul and Ritual Meals: Conclusions

We are now in a position to summarise our conclusions for Pauline ritual meals. As with baptism, there are four interrelated aspects to Paul's understanding of Christian commensality:

First, we found that ritual meals were both expressive and generative of the 'truth of the gospel'. At Antioch, we witnessed the embodiment of the gospel in the norm-breaking nature of the shared meals where the faithfulness of Jews was reconstituted away from the 'works of the Law' and around 'faith in Christ' (Gal 2:11-16). The meals, like baptism, therefore functioned reciprocally in relation to the 'gospel': the ritualised bodies of the Antiochenes *set apart* the 'gospel', 'justification' and 'faith' as hierarchically true from all other competing truth claims while reciprocally the 'gospel', 'justification' and 'faith' *informed* their ritualised bodies as distinctly recalibrated around Christ. Peter's tacit insistence on maintaining pre-messianic social conditions was nothing less than a disruption of the gospel revealed ritually through the sharing of table-fellowship and was thus in effect a denial of the dawning of the messianic age through the death and resurrection of Jesus (1:1-4; 2:19-21). The Antiochene meals thus constituted cosmic indicators that revealed a new age where all things were now redefined in relation to the Christ-event. The faithful body for the 'Jew by nature' was now understood no longer in terms of 'life as a Jew' (i.e. 'works of the Law') but rather in relation to rituals of consumption in a Christologically-defined shared lifeworld that revealed to the world the 'truth of the gospel'.

Secondly, we found that the Lord's Supper in particular revealed the 'new covenant' (καινή διαθήκη) promised in Jer 31(LXX 38):31-34 (cf. 2 Cor 3:6a). We observed a three-fold ritual relationship between the promises of Ezek 36:25-27 (fulfilled in baptism) and those of Jer 31:31-34 (fulfilled in the Lord's Supper), namely, *time*, *community* and *ethics*. In contrast to the baptism ritual that *demarcated* time, distinguishing through the baptised body the 'present evil age' from the messianic age, the Lord's Supper *collapsed* time by incorporating the Corinthians into Christ's original thanksgiving and self-giving, thereby manifesting the presence of God in their midst (1 Cor 11:23-26). The presence of

God mediated by Christ in effect constituted for Paul a *κοινωνία* that manifested a cosmic space wherein the created order was reconciled back to God through Christ's thanksgiving and self-giving (10:20-21, 25-26, 30-31). It was this divine presence that Paul understood as the primary agency by which the ethical lives of the Corinthians might be recurrently transformed. As such, Paul considered the Lord's Supper the ritualised mechanism whereby the ethical transformation foreseen by Jeremiah was fostered. The Corinthians' failure to observe the Supper in a manner concomitant with this ethical transformation thus risked incurring the judgment of God in their midst which has already fallen on some (11:30) and will continue (11:27) unless they disregard their status-enhancing meal practices and manifest social conditions constitutive of their eschatological life in Christ (11:19, 28, 33-34).

Thirdly, as we found that Ezek 36:25-27 and Jer 31:31-34 were ritually as well as conceptually related, we observed that the rituals create a composite where baptism provides the ritualised mechanism for *establishing* Christ-centered obligations while the Lord's Supper provides the ritualised mechanism for *fulfilling* such obligations. For Paul, the *σῶμα* into which the Corinthians were baptised (12:13) was reproduced every time the Lord's Supper was practiced (10:16-17). It is thus through the bodily comportment specific to the ritualised mechanisms of baptism and the Lord's Supper that a distinct Christian identity was forged.

Fourthly, because the Lord's Supper fulfills ritually their ethical obligations accepted at baptism, we observed that the Lord's Supper was the paradigmatic meal in relation to which all other eating and life practices were structured and arranged. The Lord's Supper revealed two Christ-centered frames of reference for shared eating practices:

thanksgiving and *self-giving*. By receiving all things in thanksgiving in light of Christ's paradigmatic thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστέω*) in 11:24, the Corinthians glorify God as the all-sufficient provider for their life-sustaining needs; and by expressing their thanksgiving in self-giving, they embody the Christ-enacted love by which God has reconciled the world to himself and are *therefore* part of the new creation. Because practices and dispositions as part of a bodily habitus are related homologously to their ritually disclosed cosmic orders, the Corinthians cannot engage in wider eating practices without reproducing a sacred social order, one that either embodies the renewed cosmos redeemed in Christ's

thanksgiving and self-giving, or one that is constitutive of idolatry that orients the world away from God and toward demons. The Lord's Supper was thus a central point of orientation from which the various social practices that governed the lives of the Corinthians were derived, evaluated and corrected.

A Ritual Reading of Paul: Conclusions

1. We found that for early Pauline communities, rituals and the gospel/ faith in Christ were in fact irreducible to one another. As such, our ritual reading of Paul provides an exegetical corrective to the traditional relation posited between the gospel/ faith in Christ and early Christian rituals. Because rituals are inherently *informative* as well as *formative*, ritual washings and meals both *expressed* and *generated* dialectically the sanctity of early Christian beliefs, ideas and values. As ultimate sacred postulates, terms such as εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, δικαίω and πίστις Χριστοῦ required ritualised mechanisms by which they could be set apart performatively as having unquestionable authority over and against all other alternative truth claims in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds. The *sanctity*, the unquestionableness, of the above postulates was thus generated performatively by proclamation in the context of ritual washing and eating. Reciprocally, the washings and meals were set apart as distinct from all alternative ablutions and commensality in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman worlds through the *informing* significance of the postulates. The proclamation of Christ's Lordship in the context of ritual washings and meals thus sanctified the practices, giving them their distinct identity from all other comparable ritualised gestures not associated with Christian postulates, while the ritual washings and meals set apart the proclamation and postulates as absolute and unquestionable. Christian rituals were therefore both generative of as well as communicative of the sanctity of early Christian beliefs, ideas and values.

2. Our investigation found that the primary ritualised mechanism by which the gospel and faith in Christ were set apart from all alternative loyalties was through the temporal processes inherent in ritualised activity. Specifically, the periodicity inherent in ritualisation combined with the informing and identifying significance of Christian ultimate sacred postulates to produce distinctively messianic rituals which were integral to the creation of a unique Christian conception of time. Baptism and the Lord's Supper contributed ritually to the formation of a Christian sense of time in two ways:

(i) Baptism for Paul constituted an act invested with a considerable degree of certainty, clarity and lucidity (Gal 3:27 and 1 Cor 6:11). We found this to be consistent with Rappaport's observation that rituals impose highly definite unambiguous experiences of time upon the ambiguities and vagueness inherent in quotidian life. Thus Paul could appeal to baptism as a definitive point in time when the Galatians first experienced their current status as 'sons of God' who have a new social identity (3:27), as well as when the Corinthians were identified initially and unambiguously with 'our Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of our God' (1 Cor 6:9-11). We thus concluded that baptism was for Paul an apocalyptic ritual that revealed the dawning of the messianic age through the bodies of the baptised.

(ii) This revelatory conception of ritualised time extends into the Lord's Supper, the performance of which collapsed the temporal demarcations of past, present and future (1 Cor 11:26) and thus manifested a 'time outside of time', or what Paul called τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor 10:11). This 'time outside of time' constituted a cosmic space that manifested the presence of God in the midst of his people and thus incorporated Christians into Christ's original thanksgiving and self-giving which redeemed effectually the cosmos back to God (1 Cor 11:23-26; 10:16-22).

Baptism and the Lord's Supper therefore forged a ritualised composite that *revealed*, and *incorporated* Christians into, a unique messianic conception of time.

3. In terms of 'participation in Christ', our investigation has demonstrated the importance of ritualisation for the *realisation* of the eschatological promises of Ezek 36:25-27 and Jer 31:31-34 in Paul's theology. Paul's conception of messianic time was inextricably linked to his conviction that the promise of the Spirit in Ezek 36:25-27 and the 'new covenant' in Jer 31:31-34 had in fact been fulfilled in Christ (cf. 2 Cor 3:3,6) and were indeed manifested in baptism and the Lord's Supper respectively (1 Cor 12:13; 11:25). Through a ritualised process termed 'metaphoric predication', we found that Christian ritual washings substantiated the corporate, intersubjective presence of the Spirit which identified effectually the initiate with temporal, social and ethical frames of reference specific to the pneumatically-constituted community (1 Cor 12:4-7, 13). Similarly, the Lord's Supper was an extension of the presence of the glorified body of the

resurrected Christ manifested in the gathering of the *ekklesia* and was thus a palpable revelation of the fulfillment of the Jeremiah new covenant and its promise of divine empowerment for a renewed ethical life that glorifies God. Paul himself alluded to this ritualised connection when he observed that the pneumatically-constituted σῶμα into which Christians were all baptised (1 Cor 12:13) was itself reproduced ritually in the recurrent sharing of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 10:17). Baptism and the Lord's Supper thus functioned together to *introduce* and *reproduce* respectively the pneumatic body, and thereby reconstituted space and time around the fulfillment of the Ezekiel 36 and Jeremiah 31 promises in Christ.

4. We found that the performative and expressive constituents of early Christian rituals converged in the ritualised body to form a distinct ethical identity and social space. We found that the highly definite and digital aspect of the ritual washing provided the mechanism by which one was unambiguously identified with the rules, understandings and goals with which everyday behaviour was supposed to proceed. Thus, the transmission of apocalyptic time through baptised bodies obligated Christians to live out concomitantly apocalyptic lives. An important ritualised aspect to Paul's indicative-imperative ethic is that this ritualised identification with apocalyptic reality did not entail the *fulfillment* of the ethical obligations inherent in that reality, since the purpose of ritual is not to control behaviour but to establish unambiguously the ethical norms to which subsequent behaviour might conform. Ritually-assumed obligations for Christians were valid whether or not Christians abided by those obligations; the failure to do so was a violation of obligations that they themselves had avowed. Hence, we found that terms such as δικαιόω and ἁγιάζω (1 Cor 6:11) were understood as ritually conferred statuses that informed the ritualised bodies of Christians, while the phrase πίστις Χριστοῦ involved a visually perceived orientation and allegiance toward Christ that obligated them to live out a particular kind of life. Thus baptism provided both a basis for ethical identity and a standard for ethical conformity.

While baptism established Christian ethical identity and obligation, the Lord's Supper provided a ritualised fulfillment of that identity by incorporating Christians into Christ's own thanksgiving and self-giving that returned the cosmos back to God (1 Cor 10:26, 31;

11:23-25). As a *κοινωνία* of cosmic space (1 Cor 10:16-21), Paul believed the divine presence manifested in the Corinthians' observance of the Lord's Supper was the primary agency whereby their ethical lives might be recurrently transformed. The social context of this transformation threw into relief the importance of the community as a corporate context for ethical fidelity among early Christians. As their bodies were temporally recalibrated through baptism, so their ritualised bodies mediated a comparably recalibrated social order. The distinctly cosmic and apocalyptic significance of their shared rituals meant that Christians were obligated to live out social and ethical lives that were by nature norm-breaking, transcending the national, social and gender norms of both Jewish and Graeco-Roman lifeworlds (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 12:13). Thus Antiochene meals redefined what it meant to be a faithful Jew, and the Corinthian Lord's Supper redefined Graeco-Roman patronage, civic loyalties and cultic participation. The ritualised body was therefore the location for Christian ethical identity and the point of mediation for the formation of a distinctly Christian social space.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

IQHODAYOT^a. ET by Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller (eds.). DJD XL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, 2 Vols. Ed. by R.H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Apuleius. *Metamorphoses Vol. II*. ET by J. Arthur Hanson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary. ET by Jonas C. Greenfield, et al. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* Vol 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

P. Aelius Aristides. *The Complete Works*. 2 Vols. ET by Charles A. Behr. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.

Aristotle. *The Nichomachean Ethics*. ET by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Edited by K. Ellinger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1968-76.

The Book of Jubilees. ET by J.C. VanderKam. Lovanii: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1989.

The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition, 2 Vols. ET by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 1997 (Vol. 1) 1998 (Vol. 2).

Dio Cassius. *Roman History Vol. VI*. ET by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses 37-60*. Translation by H. Lamar Crosby, Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers, Vol. I*. ET by R.D. Hicks. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities Vol. II*. ET by T.E. Page, et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. *Roman Antiquities Vol. III*. ET by Ernest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

- _____. *Roman Antiquities Vol. IV*. ET by T.E. Page, et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- Epictetus. "The Discourses." ET by E.A. Oldfather. *Epictetus, Vol. I*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- The Greek New Testament*. Edited by K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger, and A. Wilkgren, 4th Edition. United Bible Societies, 1983.
- Heraclitus. *Allegoriae Homericae*. E. Mehler (ed.). Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1851.
- Homer. *The Iliad Vol. II*. ET by A.T. Murray. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Iamblichus. *On the Pythagorean Life*. ET by Gillian Clark. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Isidore of Seville. *The Etymologies*. ET by Stephen A Barney, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Joseph and Aseneth*. C. Burchard (ed.). PVTG 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. Books I-IV ET by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- _____. *Jewish Antiquities*. Books IX-X. ET by Ralph Marcus. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- _____. *Jewish Antiquities*. Books XV-XVII. ET by Ralph Marcus. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- _____. *Jewish Antiquities*. Books XVIII-XX. ET by Louis H. Feldman. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- _____. *The Jewish War*. Books I-III. ET by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- _____. *The Jewish War*. Books IV-VII. ET by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- _____. *The Life, Against Apion*. ET by H. St. J. Thackeray. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Lactantius. *Divine Institutes*. ET by Anthony Bowen and Peter Garnsey. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003.

- Livy. *Livy Vol I*. ET by B.O. Forster. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Lucan. *The Civil War*. ET by J.D. Duff. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Lucian. "On Sacrifices." ET by A.M. Marmon. *Lucian Vol III*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Maternus, Firmicus. *The Error of the Pagan Religions*. ET by Clarence A. Forbes. New York: Newman Press, 1970.
- Philo. "Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. I*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- _____. "Every Good Man is Free." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. IX*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- _____. "On the Cherubim." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol II*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- _____. "On Flight and Finding." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. V*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- _____. "On the Special Laws: Books I-III." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. VII*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- _____. "On the Special Laws: Book IV." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. VIII*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- _____. "On the Unchangeableness of God." ET by F.H. Colson. *Philo Vol. III*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Plato. *Laws Vol. II*. ET by R.G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- _____. "Phaedo." ET by Harold North Fowler. *Plato Vol. I*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Republic Vol. I*. ET by Paul Shorey. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- _____. "Timaeus." ET by R.G. Bury. *Plato Vol. VII*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Pliny. *Letters Books 1-7*. ET by Betty Radice. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Plutarch. "Marius." ET by Bernadotte Perrin. *Plutarch's Lives, Vol. IX*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

_____. "On Moral Virtue." ET by W.C. Helmbold. *Plutarch's Moralia, Vol. VI*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

_____. "Pompey." ET by Bernadotte Perrin. *Plutarch's Lives, Vol. V*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Porphyry. *On the Cave of the Nymphs*. ET by Robert Lamberton. Barrytown, NY: Station Hill Press, 1983.

Qumran Cave 4. ET by J. Baumgarten, et al (eds.). DJD XXXV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Edited by A. Rahlfs. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1979 [1935].

The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation, Vol I. ET by Tzvee Zahavy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. M. de Jonge, et al. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978.

The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew Vol. I. ET by Jacob Neusner. New York: Ktav, 1986.

Xenophon. "Memorabilia and Oeconomicus." ET by E.C. Marchant. *Xenophon Vol. IV*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Edward. *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

_____. and David G. Horrell (eds.). *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Agersnap, Søren. *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6.1-14*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999.

Asano, Atsuhiko. *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological, and Socio-Historical Studies*. JSNTSup, 285. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

- Austin, J.L. *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Baasland, Ernst. "Persecution: A Neglected Feature in the Letter to the Galatians." *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984): 135-50.
- Barasch, Moshe. "Apocalyptic Space." In Albert I. Baumgarten (ed.). *Apocalyptic Time*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000, 305-26.
- Barclay, John M.G. "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case." *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73-93.
- _____. *Obedying the Truth: A Study in Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- _____. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *JSNT* 47 (1992): 49-74.
- _____. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- _____. "Food, Christian Identity and Global Warming: A Pauline Call for a Christian Food Taboo." *The Expository Times* 121 (12) (2010): 585-93.
- _____. *Paul and the Gift*. (unpublished manuscript).
- Barrett, C.K. "Things Sacrificed to Idols." *NTS* XI (1964-65): 196-216.
- _____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Second edition. London: A&C Black, 1971.
- _____. *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament*. Exeter: Paternoster/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Barth, Gerhard. *Die Taufe in frühchristlicher Zeit*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.
- Barton, Stephen C. "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth." *NTS* 32 (1986): 225-46.
- _____. "The Communal Dimension of Earliest Christianity." *JTS* 43 (1992): 399-427.
- Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. N.Y.: Ballentine, 1978.
- Bauman, Richard. *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1984.

- Beasley-Murray, G.R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Beck, Roger. *The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Beker, J.C. *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- _____. *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bertalotto, Pierpaolo. "Immersion and Expiation: Water and Spirit from Qumran to John the Baptist." *Henoch* 27/1-2 (2005): 163-181.
- Bertone, John. "*The Law of the Spirit*": *Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1-16*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005, 2007.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Heremneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Betz, Otto, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament." *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958/59): 213-234.
- Bird, Michael F. and Preston M. Sprinkle (eds.). *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2009.
- Bloch, M. *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Block, Daniel I. "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of *RHW* in the Book of Ezekiel." *JETS* 32 (1989): 27-49.
- _____. *The Book of Ezekiel*. 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Blomberg, C.L. "The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1-7." *Criswell Theological Review* 4 (1989) 3-20.
- Bochenski, Joseph M. *The Logic of Religion*. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Boers, Hendrikus. "The Structure and Meaning of Romans 6:1-14." *CBQ* 63.4 (2001): 664-682.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus." *ZThK* 53 (1956): 312-49.
- Borse, Udo. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1984.
- Borst, Arno. *The Ordering of Time: From the Ancient Computers to the Modern Computer*. ET by Andrew Winnard. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. ET by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Logic of Practice*. ET by Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Bousett, Wilhem. *Kyrios Christos*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1913.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Brewer, D. Instone. "1 Corinthians 9:9-11: A Literal Interpretation of 'Do Not Muzzle the Ox'." *NTS* 38 (1992): 554-65.
- Brooks, James A. and Carlton L. Winbery. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Kanham: University Press of America, 1979.
- Brownless, William H. "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls." In Krister Stendahl (ed.). *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957, 33-53.
- Bruce, F.F. *I and II Corinthians*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- _____. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- Buck, C.H. "The Date of Galatians." *JBL* 70 (1951): 113-22.

Bultmann, R. "New Testament and Mythology." In Hans Werner Bartsch (ed.). *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*. ET by R.H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1953.

_____. "ἀλήθεια." *TDNT* 1:238-51

_____. "πιστεύω κτλ." *TDNT* 6:174-228.

_____. "The Problem of Ethics in Paul." In Brian S. Rosner (ed.), *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*. ET by Christoph W. Stenschke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995, 195-216.

_____. *Theology of the New Testament*. ET by Kendrick Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Burkert, Walter. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. New York: Scribner, 1920.

Büchsel, F. "θύμος, ἐπιθυμία, κτλ." *TDNT* 3:167-71.

Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1988): 519-31.

_____. "Performativity's Social Magic." In Richard Shusterman (ed.), *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Caird, G.B. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. London: Duckworth, 1980.

Campbell, Douglas A. "'Faith' in Paul with particular reference to the questions of divine and human agency." http://www.abdn.ac.uk/divinity/Gathercole/paper-campbell.htm#_ftnref14 (2004).

_____. "The Logic of Eschatology: The Implications of Paul's Gospel for Gender as Suggested by Galatians 3.28a in Context." In idem (ed.), *Gospel and Gender: A Trinitarian Engagement with being Male and Female in Christ*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2003, 58-81.

Campbell, J.Y. "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament." *JBL* 31 (1932): 352-80.

Carlson, R.P. "The Role of Baptism in Paul's Thought." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 255-66.

Carson, D.A. "Reflections on Salvation and Justification in the New Testament." *JETS* 40/4 (1997): 581-608.

- _____, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid (eds). *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol. 1. *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Chester, Stephen. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Cheung, A.T. *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. JSNTSup 176. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. JSNTSup 75. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Christiansen, E.J. *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*. AGJU 27. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Ciampa, Roy E. *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Collier, G.D. "'That We Might not Crave Evil': The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10:1-13." *JSNT* 55 (1994): 55-75.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Origin of Christian Baptism." In *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation*. Maxwell E. Johnson (ed.). Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995, 35-57.
- _____. *Mark: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. 2nd edn. Grand Rapids, OH, 1998.
- Collins, R.F. *First Corinthians*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection." *JBL* 106 (1987):653-70.
- _____. *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.

- Coutsoumpas, Panayotis. *Paul and the Lord's Supper: A Socio-Historical Investigation*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2005.
- _____. *Community, Conflict, and the Eucharist in Roman Corinth: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2006.
- Crane, Ashley S. *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum Vol. 122. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008.
- Cross, Anthony R. "Spirit- and Water-Baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13." In Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 120-48.
- Crossan, John Dominic and Jonathan L. Reed. *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Texts*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 2001.
- Csordas, Thomas J. "Introduction: The Body as Representation and Being-In-The-World." In idem (ed.). *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 1-3.
- _____. "Prophecy and the Performance of Metaphor." *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 99, No. 2 (June 1997): 321-32.
- Cummins, Stephen Anthony Cummins. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom in Galatians 1 and 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "Gender Refusers in the Early Christian Mission: Gal 3:28 as an Interpretation of Gen 1:27b." In Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke (eds). *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series Vol. 14. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.
- De Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.
- Deflem, Matheiu. "Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner's Processual Symbolic Analysis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30 (1991): 1-25.
- DeMaris, Richard E. *The New Testament in Its Ritual World*. London/New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Dennison, William D. "Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics." *Calvin Theological Journal* 14/1 (1979): 55-78.

- Douglas, Mary. "Deciphering a Meal." In eadem. *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975, 249-75.
- _____. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. New York: Routledge, 1996 (1973).
- _____. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge, 2002 (1966).
- Dumbrell, William J. *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Dunbabin, Katherine M.D. and William J. Slater. "Roman Dining." In Michael Peachin (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 438-66.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- _____. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. London: SPCK, 1990.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- _____. ed. *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- _____. "4QMMT and Galatians." *NTS* 43 (1997): 147-153.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. "'Baptized' as Metaphor." In Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 294-310.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. ET by Joseph Ward Swain. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1954.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. *Verheißung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15-4,7*. WUNT 86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Eichhorn, A. G. *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*. ET by Jeffrey F. Cayzer. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Proclaiming the Lord's Death: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 and the Forms of Paul's Theological Argument." In D.M. Hay (ed.). *Pauline Theology, vol. 2: 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993, 103-32.
- _____. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. New York, Sheed & Ward, 1958.
- _____. *Birth and Rebirth: The Religious Meanings of Initiation and Human Culture*. ET by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Galatians*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Evans, Craig. "The Baptism of John in a Typological Context." In Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.). *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. SNTSS 234. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 45-71.
- Farmer, William R. "Peter and Paul, and the Tradition concerning 'The Lord's Supper' in 1 Corinthians 11:23-26." In Ben F. Meyer (ed.). *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992, 35-55.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- _____. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- Feeley-Harnik, Gillian. *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in Early Christianity*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.
- Feeney, Denis. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Feldherr, Andrew. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Baptismal Motifs in the Ancient Church." In idem (ed.). *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993.
- _____. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 3rd edn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

- _____. Everett Ferguson. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- Fernandez, James. "The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture." *Current Anthropology* 15 (1974): 119-146.
- Finn, Thomas M. *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Fisk, Bruce N. "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8-10." *TrinJ* 10:1 (1989): 49-70.
- Fotopoulos, John. "The Rhetorical Situation, Arrangement, and Argumentation of 1 Corinthians 8:1-13: Insights into Paul's Instructions on Idol-Food in Greco-Roman Context." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 47:1-4 (2002): 165-98
- _____. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. WUNT II 151. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- _____. "Arguments Concerning Food Offered to Idols: Corinthian Quotations and Pauline Refutations in a Rhetorical *Partitio* (1 Corinthians 8:1-9)." *CBQ* (2005): 611-31.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apostolic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." *JTS* 42 (1991): 532-564.
- Friesen, Steven S., et al (eds.). *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "εὐαγγελίζομαι." *TDNT* 2:707-37.
- Fung, Ronald Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- Furnish, Victor P. *II Corinthians*. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- _____. "Belonging to Christ: A Paradigm for Ethics in First Corinthians." *Interpretation* 44/2 (1990): 145-57.
- Gardner, P.D. *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

- Garlington, Don. *An Exposition of Galatians: A New Perspective/Reformational Reading*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.
- Gaventa, Beverly R. "'You Proclaim the Lord's Death': 1 Corinthians 11:26 and Paul's Understanding of Worship." *RevExp* 80 (1983): 377-87.
- _____. "Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm." *Novum Testamentum* 28, no. 4 (1986): 309-26.
- Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture." In *idem. The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973, 3-30.
- Gluckman, Mary and Max Gluckman. "On Drama and Games and Athletic Contests." In S.F. Moore and B. Myerhoff (eds). *Secular Ritual*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977, 227-243.
- Gooch, Paul W. "'Conscience' in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10." *NTS* 33 (1987): 244-54.
- Gooch, Peter David. *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.
- Goppelt, L. "πίνω κτλ." *TDNT* 6:159-60.
- _____. "ποτήριον." *TDNT* 6:153-8.
- Gordon, Richard. "Institutionalized Religious Options: Mithraism." In Jörg Rüpke (ed.). *A Companion to Roman Religion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007, 392-405.
- Gressmann, Hugo. "H KOINΩNIA TΩN ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ." *ZNW* 20 (1921): 224-30.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
- Guy, Laurie. "'Naked' Baptism in the Early Church: The Rhetoric and the Reality." *Journal of Religious History* 27 (2—3): 133-42.
- Haber, Susan. *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. Ed. by Adele Reinhartz. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit: Paul's Defense of His Ministry in II Corinthians 2:14-3:3*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- _____. "Paul and His Interpreters since F.C. Baur." In Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (eds.). *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993, 666-79.

- _____. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- _____. "The 'Temple of the Spirit' as the Inaugural Fulfillment of the New Covenant within the Corinthian Correspondence." *Ex Auditu* 12 (1996): 29-42.
- _____. "Paul and the Exile of Israel in Galatians 3-4." In James M. Scott (ed.). *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997, 329-71.
- _____. "Eschatology and Ethics: The Future of Israel and the Nations in Romans 15:1-13." *Tyndale Bulletin* 51.2 (2000): 161-92.
- Hall, Robert G. "Arguing Like and Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Tradition." *NTS* 42 (1996): 434-53.
- Hanges, James Constantine. *Christ, the Image of the Church: The Construction of a New Cosmology and the Rise of Christianity*. Aurora, CO: The Davies Group, 2006.
- Harrill, J. Albert. "Coming of Age and Putting on Christ: The *Toga Virilis* Ceremony, Its Paraenesis, and Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Galatians." *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 251-77.
- Hartman, Lars. "Baptism." In David N. Freeman (ed.). *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 1.583-94.
- _____. *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- _____. *First Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.
- _____. *The Letter to the Galatians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. The New Interpreter's Bible: Second Corinthians – Philemon*, Vol. 11. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000, 183-348.
- _____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. 2nd edn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002.
- Heitmüller, W. *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus. Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Helman, Cecil G. *Culture, Health and Illness: An Introduction for Health Professionals*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, 1990.

- Hill, David. *Greek Words with Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*. SNTSMS 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967.
- Hofius, Otfried. "The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Supper Tradition: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 11:23b-25." In Ben F. Meyer (ed.). *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992.
- Hogan, Pauline Nigh. "No Longer Male and Female": *Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*. Library of New Testament Studies. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Hogeterp, Albert L.A. *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Tradition-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Hollander, Harm W. "The Idea of Fellowship in 1 Corinthians 10:14-22." *NTS* 55:4 (2009): 456-70.
- Hooker, Morna D. *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Horn, F.W. *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie*. FRLANT 154. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- _____. and R. Zimmermann (eds.). *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ: Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik*. WUNT 238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- _____. "Theological Principle or Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1." *JSNT* 67 (1997): 83-114.
- _____. (ed.). *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- _____. "Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: Retrospect and Prospect." In idem (ed.). *Social Scientific Interpretations of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999, 3-27.
- _____. "Idol-Food, Idolatry and Ethics in Paul." In Stephen C. Barton (ed.). *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity*. London: T&T Clark, 2007, 120-40.
- Horsely, Richard A. "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8-10." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 581-89.

- _____. "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6." *NTS* 27 (1979): 32-51.
- _____. "Paul and Slavery: A Critical Alternative to Recent Readings." *Semeia* 83-84 (1998): 153-200.
- Horstmann, A. "οἶδα." *EDNT* 2:493-4.
- Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. Society for New Testament Monograph Series 119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hübner, H. "ἀλήθεια." *EDNT* 1:57-60.
- Hummel, Horace D. *Ezekiel*. 2 Vols. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007.
- Hunn, Debbie. "The Baptism of Galatians 3:27: A Contextual Approach." *The Expository Times* (August 2004): 372-75.
- Hunzinger, C.H. "ῥαπτίζω." *TDNT* 6: 976-84.
- Hurd, John Coolidge. *The Origins of I Corinthians*. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- _____. *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- _____. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.
- Innis, Robert E. "The Tacit Logic of Ritual Embodiments." In Don Handelman and Galina Lindquist (eds.). *Ritual in Its Own Right*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005, 197-212.
- Irshai, Oded. "Dating the Eschaton: Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Calculations in Late Antiquity." In Albert I. Baumgarten (ed.). *Apocalyptic Time*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2000, 113-54.
- Jackson, Michael. *Paths Toward a Clearing: Radical Empiricism and Ethnographic Inquiry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- James, William. *Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1902.
- Johnson Hodge, Caroline. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Käsemann, E. *Leib und Leib Christi*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933.

_____. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper." In idem. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. ET by W.J. Montague. London: SCM Press, 1964, 108-35.

_____. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology." In idem. *New Testament Questions of Today*. ET by W.J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

Kerst, R. "1 Kor 8:6 – Ein vorpaulinischches Taufbekenntnis?" *ZNW* 66 (1975): 130-9.

Kim, Jung Hoon. *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus*. JSNTSup. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Kim, Seyoon. "Imitatio Christi (1 Corinthians 11:1): How Paul Imitates Jesus Christ in Dealing with Idol Food (1 Corinthians 8-10)." *BBR* 13.2 (2003): 193-226.

Kincaid, Harold. "Functional Explanation and Evolutionary Social Science." In Stephen P. Turner and Mark W. Risjord (eds.). *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006, 213-48

Klauck, Hans-Joseph. *Herrenmahl und Hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1986.

_____. "Presence in the Lord's Supper: 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 in the Context of Hellenistic Religious History." In Ben F. Meyer (ed.). *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992, 57-73.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Klingbeil, Gerald. "Between Law and Grace: Ritual and Ritual Studies in Recent Evangelical Thought." *JATS* 13/2 (2002): 46-63.

_____. *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Knox, D.B. "The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians." *EvQ* XIII (1941): 262-8.

Kohn, Risa Levitt. *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*. JSOTSup 358. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Kok, Ezra Hon-seng. *The Truth of the Gospel: A Study in Galatians 2:15-21*. Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2000.

- Köpping, Klaus-Peter, et al (eds). *Ritual and Identity: Performative Practices as Effective Transformations of Social Reality*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006.
- Köster, H. “φύσις κτλ.” *TDNT* 9:251-77.
- Kremer, J. “ὁράω.” *EDNT* 2:526-29.
- Kruse, Colin G. *Paul, the Law, and Justification*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Kwon, Yon-Gyong. *Eschatology in Galatians: Rethinking Paul’s Response to the Crisis in Galatia*. WUNT 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Earlier Epistles of St Paul: their motive and origin*. London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- Lakey, Michael. *Image and Glory of God: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as a Case Study in Bible, Gender and Hermeneutics*. Library of New Testament Studies. London & New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Lambrecht, Jan. “Paul’s Reasoning in Galatians 2:11-21.” In by J.D.G. Dunn (ed.). *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996, 53-74.
- _____. *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001.
- Lampe, Peter. “The Eucharist: Identifying with Christ on the Cross.” *Int* 48 (1994): 36-49.
- Landmesser, Christof. “Begründungsstrukturen paulinischer Ethik.” In F.W. Horn and R. Zimmermann (eds.). *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ: Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik*. WUNT 238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 177-96.
- Lawrence, Jonathan D. *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Lawrence, Louise. “Ritual and the First Urban Christians: Boundary Crossings of Life and Death.” In Todd D. Still and David G. Horrell (eds.). *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later*. New York: T&T Clark, 2009, 99-115.
- Leach, Edmund. *Culture and Communication: the logic by which symbols are connected*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

- Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- Lightfoot, J.B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Zu 1 Cor 10.26, 31." *ZNW* 47 (1956): 277-80.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. "Defining the Faithful Character of the Covenant Community: Galatians 2:15-21 and Beyond." In J.D.G. Dunn (ed.). *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996, 75-97.
- Longenecker, Richard N. "Galatians." In *Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 41. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- Lyon, M.L. and J.M. Barbalet. "Society's Body: Emotion and the 'Somatization' of Social Theory." In Thomas J. Csordas (ed.). *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 48-67.
- Lyons, G. *Pauline Autobiography: Towards a New Understanding*. SBLDS 73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Lyons, Michael A. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. New York and London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Lyunnet, Stanislas et al. *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1998.
- MacDonald, D. *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mack, Burton L. "On Redescribing Christian Origins." In idem. *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy*. New York & London: Continuum, 2001, 59-80.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. "Two types of Conversion in Early Christianity." In Everett Ferguson (ed.). *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1-25.

- Marshall, Howard. "The Meaning of the Verb 'Baptize'." In Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross. *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, 8-24.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Martin, Troy W. "The Covenant of Circumcision (Genesis 17:9-14) and the Situational Antitheses in Galatians 3:28." *JBL* 122 No. 1 (Spring 2003): 111-25, 124.
- _____. "Paul's Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts." In J. Fotopoulos (ed.). *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*. SNT 122. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 105-26.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *NTS* 31 (1985): 410-424.
- _____. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Matlock, R. Barry Matlock. "The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9." *JSNT* 30.2 (2007): 173-203.
- Maurer, C. "συνείδησις." *TDNT* 7.898-918.
- McGuire, Meredith B. "Religion and the Body: Rematerializing the Human Body in the Social Sciences of Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 29 (3) (1990): 283-296.
- Mcrae, Rachel M. "Eating with Honor: The Corinthian Lord's Supper in Light of Voluntary Association Meal Practices." *JBL* 130 no. 1 (2011): 165-81.
- McRay, John. *Paul: His Life and Teaching*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Meeks, Wayne. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *History of Religions* 13 (1973): 165-208.
- _____. "'And Rose up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10.1-22." *JSNT* 16 (1982): 64-78.
- _____. *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

- Meggitt, Justin J. "Meat Consumption and Social Conflict in Corinth." *JTS* 45 (1994): 137-41.
- Mein, Andrew. *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Messer, Ellen and Michael Lambek. *Ecology and the Sacred: Engaging the Anthropology of Roy A. Rappaport*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Meyer, Ben F. (ed.). *One Loaf, One Cup: Ecumenical Studies of 1 Cor 11 and Other Eucharistic Texts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1992.
- Mihaila, Corin. *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4*. London: Continuum International Publishing, 2009.
- Mitchell, Jon P. Mitchell. "Ritual." In Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (eds). *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge, 1996, 490-93.
- Mitchell, M.M. "Concerning ΠΕΠΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians." *NovT* 31 (1989): 229-56.
- _____. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Moo, Douglas. "Paul and the Law in the Last Ten Years." *SJT* 40 (1987): 287-307.
- Munk, J. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor., VIII, 1-13; X,23-XI,1)." *RB* 85 (1978): 543-74.
- _____. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. GNS 6; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1983.
- Mussner, Franz. *Der Galaterbrief*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1974.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- _____. "What was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?." In idem (ed.). *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Peabody: Hedrickson Publishers, 2002, 348-361.
- _____. "The Polytheist Identity of the 'Weak', and Paul's Strategy to 'Gain' Them: A New Reading of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1." In Stanley, Porter (ed.). *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*. Pauline Studies, Vol. 5. Boston, Brill Academic Publishers, 2009, 179-210.

- Newton, Derek. *Deity and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. JSNTSup 169; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Neyrey, Jerome. "Body Language in 1 Corinthians: The Use of Anthropological Models for Understanding Paul and His Opponents." *Semeia* 35 (1986): 129-70.
- _____. *Paul, In Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.
- Nielsen, Inge and Hanne Sigismund Nielsen (eds.). *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.
- Nock, A.D. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.
- O'Brien, P.T. "Justification in Paul and Some Crucial Issues of the Last Two Decades." In D.A. Carson (ed.). *Right With God: Justification in the Bible and the World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992, 65-92.
- O'Donnell, M.B. "Two Opposing Views of Baptism with/by the Holy Spirit and of 1 Corinthians 12:13: Can Grammatical Investigation Bring Clarity?." In S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.). *Baptism, The New Testament and the Church*. JSNTSup 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Oepke, Albrecht. *Der Brief De Paulus And Die Galater*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957.
- _____. "βάπτω, βαπτίζω," *TDNT* 1:529-46
- _____. "δύω κτλ." *TDNT* 2:318-21.
- _____. "εἰς." *TDNT* 2:420-434
- _____. "λούω." *TDNT* 4:295-307.
- Økland, Jorunn. *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space*. JSNTSup 269. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Onesti, K.L. and M.T. Brauch. "Righteousness, Righteousness of God." In Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (eds.) *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993, 827-837.

- Parsons, Michael. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing." In Brian S. Rosner (ed.). *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 217-250;
- Pascuzzi, Maria. "Baptism-based Allegiance and the Divisions in Corinth: A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 1:13-17." *CBQ* 71.4 (2009): 813-29.
- Pedersen, S. "εὐρίσκω." *EDNT* 2:82-84.
- Peirce, C.S. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Vol. 2 (1893-1913). Ed. by The Peirce Edition Project, Nathan Houser, et al. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Penn, Michael Philip. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Pesce, Mauro. "Christ Did Not Send Me To Baptise but to Evangelize." In Lorenzo De Lorenzi (ed.). *Paul de Tarse: Apôtre du Notre Temps*. Série monographique de "Benedictina," Section paulinienne 1. Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul, 1979.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Paraenesis in Pauline Scholarship and in Paul – An Intricate Relationship." In James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen (eds). *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH and Co., 2004, 267-98.
- _____. "Rituals of Purification, Rituals of Initiation: Phenomenological, Taxonomical and Culturally Evolutionary Reflections." In David Hellholm, et al (eds.). *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2011.
- Philip, Finny. *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology*. WUNT II/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Phua, Richard Liong-Seng. *Idolatry and Authority: A Study in 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Polanyi, Michael. *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Porter, S.E. and A.R. Cross (eds.). *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church*. JSNTSup 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- _____. and A.R. Cross (eds). *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- "ποτίζω." *EDNT* 3:142.

Preisker, H. “εὐρίσκω.” *TDNT* 2:769-70.

Quell, G. “ἀλήθεια.” *TDNT* 1.232-37.

Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. WUNT II/283. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

_____. *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*. JSNTSup 43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Rambo, Lewis R. *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Rappaport, Roy. “Ritual, Sanctity, and Cybernetics.” *American Anthropologist* 73 (1971): 59-76.

_____. “On Cognized Models.” In idem. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979, 97-144.

_____. “The Obvious Aspects of Ritual.” In idem. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979, 173-221.

_____. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Recanat, François. *Meaning and Force: The Pragmatics of Performative Utterances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Rengstorff, K.H. “ἁμαρῶλος κτλ.” *TDNT* 1:317-333.

Rendtorff, F.M. *Die Taufe im Urchristentum im Lichte der neueren Forschungen: ein kritischer Bericht*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Churches of Galatia: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.

Robertson, C.K. *Conflict in Corinth: Redefining the System*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Rouse, Joseph. “Practice Theory.” In Stephen P. Turner and Mark W. Risjord (eds.). *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006, 639-82.

Runia, Klaas. "Justification and Roman Catholicism." In *Right With God: Justification in the Bible and the World*. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992, 197-215.

Sampley, J. Paul. "First Corinthians." In L.E. Keck (ed.). *New Interpreter's Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002, 771-1003.

Sandelin, Karl Gustav. "Does Paul Argue Against Sacramentalism and Over-Confidence in 1 Cor 10:1-14?" In Peder Borgen and Søren Giversen (eds.). *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1995, 165-82

Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

_____. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

_____. "Jewish Association with Gentiles and Galatians 2:11-14." In Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (eds.). *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Nashville: Abingdom, 1990, 170-88.

Sandnes, Karl Olav. *Paul – One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-Understanding*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.

_____. *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles*. SNTSMS 120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002,

_____. "Equality Within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspective on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother- or Sisterhood and a Family." In Halvor Moxnes (ed.). *Constructing Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 1997, 150-65.

Sarksaune, Oskar. "The Conversion of Justin Martyr." In Everett Ferguson (ed.). *Conversion, Catechumenate, and Baptism in the Early Church*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993, 45-66.

Schatzki, Theodore R. *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

_____. "Subject, Body, Place." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol 91, no. 4 (Dec 2001): 698-702.

Schlatter, A. *Die Korintherbriefe: Ausgelegt für Bibelleser*. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1974.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951.

- Schmaus, Warren. "Categories and Classification in the Social Sciences." In Stephen P. Turner and Mark W. Risjord (eds.). *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006, 429-58.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Gerechtigkeit und Christusgegenwart: Vorpaulinische und nachpaulinische Tauftheologie*. GTA 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- _____. "Paulus und Epiktet – zwei ethische Modelle." In F.W. Horn and R. Zimmermann (eds.). *Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ: Kontexte und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik*. WUNT 238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, 137-58.
- Schowalter, Daniel N. and Steven Friesen (eds.). *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- _____. "Seeking Shelter in Roman Corinth: Archaeology and the Placement of Paul's Communities." In Steven S. Friesen, et al (eds.). *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Boston: Brill, 2010, 327-41.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 3 Vols. Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991, 1995, 1999.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. "Works of the Law." In Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (eds.). *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993, 975-79.
- _____. *Romans*, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- _____. "Baptism in the Epistles: An Initiation Rite for Believers." In idem and Shawn D. Wright (eds.). *Believer's Baptism: Sign of the New Covenant in Christ*. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006.
- Schrenk, G. "δικαιόω κτλ." *TDNT* 2:211-19.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. London: SCM, 1995.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. ET by W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912.
- _____. *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931.
- Schweizer, E. "υἱός κτλ." *TDNT* 8:334-92.

- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. WUNT 2.48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- _____. “‘For as Many as are of Works of the Law are Under a Curse’ (Gal 3:10).” In James A. Sanders and Craig A. Evans (eds.). *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. JSNTSup 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, 187-221.
- _____. *Paul and the Nations: the Old Testament and Jewish background of Paul’s mission to the nations with special reference to the destination of Galatians*. WUNT 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Searle, J. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Seesemann, H. “οἰδα.” *TDNT* 5:116-9
- Segal, Alan F. *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Seifrid, Mark A. “Paul, Luther, and Justification in Gal 2:15-21.” *WTJ* 65 no. 2 (Fall 2003): 215-230.
- Sekki, Arthur Everett. *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*. SBLDS 110. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Silva, Moisés. “Eschatological Structures in Galatians.” In Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva (eds.). *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994, 140-162.
- Smit, Joop. “‘Do Not Be Idolaters’: Paul’s Rhetoric in First Corinthians 10:1-22.” *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997): 40-53.
- _____. “The Function of First Corinthians 10,23-30: A Rhetorical Anticipation,” *Bib* 78 (1997): 377-88.
- Smith, Barry D. “The Problem with the Observance of the Lord’s Supper in the Corinthian Church.” *BBR* 20.4 (2010): 517-44.
- Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Smith, J.Z. Smith. “Garments of Shame.” *History of Religions* 5 (1966): 217–238.

- Snoek, J.A.M. *Initiations: A Methodological Approach to the Application of Classification and Definition Theory in the Study of Rituals*. Pijnacker: Dutch Efficiency Bureau, 1987.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts." *Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997): 219-38.
- Stendahl, K. *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.
- Stern, Sacha. *Time and Process in Ancient Judaism*. Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2007.
- Steudel, A. "The Development of Essenic Eschatology." In Albert I. Baumgarten (ed.). *Apocalyptic Time*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2000, 79-86.
- Still, E. Coyle. "Paul's Aims Regarding ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ: A New Proposal for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1." *Novum Testamentum* XLIV, 4 (2002): 333-43.
- Stockhausen, Carol K. *Moses' Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1-4,6*. AnBib 116. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989.
- Stowers, Stanley K. "Greeks Who Sacrifice and Those Who Do Not: Toward an Anthropology of Greek Religion." In L.M. White and O.L. Yarbrough (eds.). *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995, 293-333.
- _____. "Elusive Coherence: Ritual and Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 10-11." In E.A. Castelli and H. Taussig (eds.). *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996, 68-83.
- _____. "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" In Fabian E. Udoh, et al (eds.). *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 16. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2008, 352-71.
- _____. "Kinds of Myth, Meals, and Power: Paul and the Corinthians." In Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller (eds.). *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011, 105-50.
- _____. "Pauline Scholarship and The Third Way in Social Theory." (unpublished manuscript).
- Strecker, G. "εὐαγγελίζω." *EDNT* 69-74

- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. ET by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- Strecker, Christian. *Die liminale Theologie des Paulus: Zugänge zur paulinischen Theologie aus kulturalanthropologischer Perspektive*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Strüder, Christof W. "Preferences not Parties: the Background of 1 Cor 1,12." *ETL* 79 (2003) 431-55.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- _____. *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- Tambiah, S.J. "The Magical Power of Words." *Man* n.s. 3, no. 2 (1968): 175-208.
- Taylor, Joan. *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- _____. *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-century Alexandria: Philo's 'Therapeutae' Reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Taylor, Nicholas H. "Paul's Apostolic Legitimacy: Autobiographical Reconstruction in Gal 1:11-2:14." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 83 (June 1993): 65-77.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. ET by J.H. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- _____. "Social Integration and Sacramental Activity." In idem. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. ET by J.H. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982, 145-74.
- _____. *The Religion of the Earliest Churches: Creating a Symbolic World*. ET by John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Thielman, Frank. *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*. NovTSup 61. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Realized Eschatology at Corinth." *NTS* 24:4 (1978): 510-26.
- _____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Publishing Company, 2000.

- Tomson, P.J. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Assen/Maastricht/Minneapolis: Can Corcum/Fortress, 1990.
- Tonstad, Sigve. “πίστις Χριστοῦ: Reading Paul in a New Paradigm.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring 2002): 37-59.
- Torrance, T.F. “Proselyte Baptism.” *NTS* 1, no. 2 (November 1954): 150-54.
- Tso, Marcus K.M. *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation*. WUNT 292. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Tucker, J. Brian. “Baths, Baptism, and Patronage: The Continuing Role of Roman Social Identity in Corinth.” In Kathy Ehrensperger and J. Brian Tucker (eds). *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation*. LNTS, 428. London: T&T Clark, 2010, 173-88.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. JPTSUP 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Turner, Terence. “Social body and Embodied Subject: Bodiliness, Subjectivity, and Sociality Among the Kayapó.” *Cultural Anthropology* 10 (2) (1995): 143-170.
- Turner, Victor W. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- _____. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Uro, Risto. “Ritual and Christian Origins.” In D. Neufeld, R. DeMaris (eds.). *Understanding the Social World of the New Testament*. London: Routledge, 2010, 223-35.
- Van Gennep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. ET by Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Vermes, G. “Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources.” *NTS* 4 (1958): 308-19.
- Wagner, Günter. *Pauline Baptism and The Pagan Mysteries: The Problem of the Pauline Doctrine of Baptism in Romans VI. 1-11, in the Light of Religio-Historical “Parallels.”* ET by J.P. Smith. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967.
- Walden, Wayne. “Galatians 3:28: Grammar Observations.” *ResQ* 51 no. 1, (2009): 45-50.
- Walter, N. “Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden.” *NTS* 25 (1979): 422-42.

_____. “ἐθνος.” *EDNT* 1:381-383

Walters, James C. “Paul and the Politics of Meals in Roman Corinth.” In Steven S. Friesen, et al (eds.). *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Boston: Brill, 2010, 343-64.

Watson, Francis. “By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution.” In Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (eds.). *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2009, 147-63.

Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptiser and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. JSNTSup 62. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Weckman, George. “Understanding Initiation.” *History of Religions*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Aug., 1970): 62-79.

Wedderburn, A.J.M. *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology Against Its Graeco-Roman Background*. WUNT 44. Tübingen: Mohr Seibek, 1987.

Weisner, A. “διάκονος.” *EDNT* 1:302-4.

Weiß, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Welborn, L.L. “On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Cor 1-4 and Ancient Politics.” *JBL* 106.1 (1987): 85-111.

White, Joel. “Paul’s Cosmology: The Witness of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians.” In Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough (eds.). *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Library of New Testament Studies. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

Wilckens, U. “ὑποκρίνομαι.” *TDNT* 8:559-71.

Wild, Robert A. *Water in the Cultic Worship of Isis and Sarapis*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Williams II, C.K. “Roman Corinth as a Commercial Center.” In T.E. Gregory (ed.). *The Corinthia in the Roman Period*. JRASup, 8. Ann Arbor, MI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1994, 31-46.

Willis, Wendell Lee. *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. SBLDS 68. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

_____. “1 Corinthians 8-10: A Retrospective After Twenty-Five Years.” *ResQ* 49.2 (2007): 103-12.

- Wilson, Robert R. "The Biblical Roots of Apocalyptic." In Abbas Amanat and Magnus T. Bernhardsson (eds.), *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2002), 56-66.
- Winter, Bruce. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.
- Witherington III, Ben. "Not So Idle Thoughts about *Eidolothuton*." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993): 237-54
- _____. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- _____. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. London, New York: T&T Clark, 1998.
- _____. *Troubled Waters: The Real New Testament Theology of Baptism*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Wolff, C. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther 8-16*. THKNT. Berlin: Evangelische, 1982.
- Wong, Ka Leung. *Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Wright, N.T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.
- _____. "Gospel and Theology in Galatians." In L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. JNSTSup108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, 222-239.
- Yates, John W. *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*. WUNT II 251. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008.
- Yeo, Khiok-Khng. *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Ysebaert, J. *Greek Baptismal Terminology: Its Origins and Early Development*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V., 1962.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A social-scientific approach to the separation between Judaism and Christianity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

